

EXISTENTIALLY CLOSED LOCALLY FINITE GROUPS

SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We investigate this class of groups originally called ulf (universal locally finite groups) of cardinality λ . We prove that for every locally finite group G there is a canonical existentially closed extension of the same cardinality, unique up to isomorphism and increasing with G . Also we get, e.g. existence of complete members (i.e. with no non-inner automorphisms) in many cardinals (provably in ZFC). We also get a parallel to stability theory in the sense of investigating definable types.

§ 0. INTRODUCTION

§ 0(A). Background.

On lf (locally finite) groups and exlf (existentially closed locally finite) groups, see the book by Kegel-Wehrfritz [KW73]; exlf groups were originally called ulf (= universal locally finite) groups, we change as the word “universal” has been used with a different meaning, see Definition 0.8.

In particular there is one and only one such group of cardinality $\aleph_0$. Hall proved that every lf group can be extended to a exlf group, as follows. It suffices to find $H \supseteq G$ such that if $K \subseteq L$ are finite and f embeds K into G , then some $g \supseteq f$ embed L into H . To get such H , for finite $K \subseteq G$ let $E_{G,K} = \{(a, b) : aK = bK\}$ and let $G^\oplus$ be the group of permutations f of G such that for some finite $K \subseteq G$ we have $a \in G \Rightarrow aE_{G,K}f(a)$; now $b \in G$ should be identified with $f_b \in G^\oplus$ where f_b is defined by $f_b(x) = xb$ hence $f_b \in G^\oplus$ because if $b \in K \subseteq G$ then $a \in G \Rightarrow f_b(a) = ab \in abK = aK$ and $f_{b_2} \circ f_{b_1}(x) = f_{b_1b_2}(x)$. Now $H = G^\oplus$ is essentially as required.

The proof gives a canonical extension. This means for example that every automorphism of G can be extended to an automorphism of $G^\oplus$ and, moreover, we can do it uniformly so preserving isomorphisms. Still we may like to have more; (for infinite G) the extension $G^\oplus$ is of cardinality $2^{|G|}$ rather than the minimal value - $|G| + \aleph_0$ (not to mention having to repeat this ω times). Also if $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ the connection between $G_1^\oplus$ and $G_2^\oplus$ is not clear, i.e. failure of “naturality”. A major point of the present work is a construction of a canonical existentially closed extension of G which has those two additional desirable properties.

Note that in model theoretic terminology the exlf groups are the $(D, \aleph_0)$ -homogeneous groups, with D the set of isomorphism types of finite groups or more exactly complete qf (= quantifier free) types of finite tuples generating a finite group. We use

Date: February 17, 2011.

Partially supported by the ISF, Israel Science Foundation. Publication 312.
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

quantifier free types as we use embeddings (rather than, e.g. elementary embeddings). Let $D(G)$ be the set of isomorphism types of finitely generated subgroups of the group G .

By Grossberg-Shelah [GrSh:174], if $\lambda = \aleph_0$ then no $G \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$, the class of exlf groups of cardinality λ , is universal in it, i.e., such that every other member is embeddable into it. But if κ is a compact cardinal and $\lambda > \kappa$ is strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0$ then there is a universal exlf in cardinality λ (a special case of a general theorem).

Wehrfritz asked on the categoricity of the class of exlf groups in any $\lambda > \aleph_0$. This was answered by Macintyre-Shelah [McSh:55] which prove that in every $\lambda > \aleph_0$ there are 2^λ non-isomorphic members of $\mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$. This was disappointing in some sense: in $\aleph_0$ the class is categorical, so the question was perhaps motivated by the hope that also general structures in the class can be understood to some extent.

Concerning the existence of a complete, locally finite group of cardinality λ (complete means here that every automorphism is inner): Hickin [Hic78] proved one exists in $\aleph_1$ (and more, e.g. find a family of $2^{\aleph_1}$ such groups pairwise far, i.e. no uncountable group is embeddable in two of them). Thomas [Tho86] assumed G.C.H. and built one in every successor cardinal (and more, e.g. has no Abelian or just solvable subgroup of the same cardinality).

In 1985 the author wrote notes (in Hebrew) for proving that there are complete exlf groups when, e.g., $\lambda = \mu^+, \mu^{\aleph_0} = \mu$; using black boxes and “anti-prime” construction, i.e. using definable types as below; here we exclusively use qf (quantifier free) types; this was announced in [Sh:300b], but the work was not properly finished. To do so was our first aim here.

We show that though the class $\mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ is very “unstable” there is a large enough set of definable types so we can imitate stability theory and have reasonable control in building exlf groups, using quantifier free types. This may be considered a “correction” to the non-structure results discussed above.

§ 0(B). The results.

In §1 we present somewhat abstractly our results relying on the existence of a dense and closed so called $\mathfrak{S}$, a set of schemes of definitions of the relevant types. In particular (in the first avenue):

- ⊙₁ for every $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\leq \lambda}^{\text{lf}}$ there is $H_G \in K_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$ which is λ -full over G (hence over any $G' \subseteq G$; see Definition 1.24) and $\mathfrak{S}$ -constructible over it
- ⊙₂ if $H \in \mathbf{K}_{< \lambda}^{\text{lf}}$ is λ -full over $G (\in \mathbf{K}_{\leq \lambda}^{\text{lf}})$ then H_G from above can be embedded into H over G , see 1.30(4).

So in some sense H_G is prime over G . Still, we would like to have canonicity so uniqueness. There are some additional avenues helpful toward this.

The second avenue tries to get results which are nicer by assuming $\mathfrak{S}$ is so called symmetric which is the parallel of being stable in this context. Under this assumption we prove the existence of a canonical closure of a locally finite group to an exlf one.

The third avenue is without assuming “ $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric” but using a more complicated construction, for it we have similar, somewhat weaker results using special linear orders. The failure of symmetry seems to draw you to order the relevant

pairs $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a})$ for G . That is, trying to repeat the construction in 1.21(2), without symmetry we have to well order or at least linearly order $\text{def}(G)$; this suffices by 1.17(9). At first glance we have to linearly order $\text{def}(G)$, but we take a list of $\text{def}(G)$, with each appearing λ times and linearly order it such that it does not induce a linear order of $\text{def}(G)$. See below.

To stress the generality in addition to the class $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ of lf-groups we use $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$, the class of ordered locally finite groups (see 0.2) for them the proof of the existence of a suitable $\mathfrak{S}$ is easier. Naturally for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ we certainly do not have a symmetric $\mathfrak{S}$.

In §2 we show that $\mathfrak{S}$ as needed in §1 exists, but not necessarily symmetric and define and investigate some specific schemes used later. In §3 we find a fourth avenue which is more specific to the class of lf groups, we show that we can induce symmetry, i.e. define symmetric constructions even for non-symmetric $\mathfrak{S}$ hence get somewhat better results, in particular we construct reasonable closures.

In §4(A), we use amalgamation preserving commuting and so can get a new relative NF^3 of NF . In §4(B) we deal with some related schemes (of types). In §4(C) we deal with types with infinitely many variables.

In §5 we prove the existence of a complete group $G_* \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$ when $\lambda = \mu^+$, $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$. Moreover, the existence of a complete extension $G_* \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$ of an arbitrary $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\leq \mu}^{\text{lf}}$.

Some of the definitions and claims work also in quite a general framework, but it is not clear at present how interesting this is, still we consider some expansions of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$, and comment on them in §6. In a more general direction this is done in [Sh:F1120, §1] the fg-aec.

Note that on $(\mathbf{K}, \leq_{\mathfrak{S}})$ we may generalize stability theory, in particular when $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric (see §1) or when we use the symmetrized version (see §3). In particular, we can investigate orthogonality, parallelism, super-stability, and indiscernible sets which Δ -converge ([Sh:300] or [Sh:300a]). A class somewhat similar to $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$, for an existentially closed countable group L is $\mathbf{K}_L$, the class of groups G such that every f.g. subgroup is embeddable into L . We are preparing a parallel of this work on such classes ([Sh:F981]) and continuing §4 and §5 in [Sh:F1120]. We thank Omer Zilberboim for some help in the proofs.

§ 0(C). Preliminaries.

Definition 0.1. 1) G is a lf (locally finite) group if G is a group and every finitely generated subgroup is finite.

2) G is an exlf (existentially closed lf) group (in [KW73] it is called ulf, universal locally finite group) when G is a locally finite group and for every finite groups $K \subseteq L$ and embedding of K into G , the embedding can be extended to an embedding of L into G .

3) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ be the class of lf (locally finite) groups (partially ordered by $\subseteq$, being a subgroup) and let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ be the class of existentially closed $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$.

3A) Let $\mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{lf}}$ be the class of $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ of cardinality λ , let $\mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{exlf}}$ be the class of $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ of cardinality λ .

4) Let $\text{fsb}(M)$ be the set of f.g. (finitely generated) sub-structures of M .

We may use the class of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$, linearly ordered lf groups.

- Definition 0.2.** 1) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ be the class of structures M which are an expansion of a lf group $G = G_M$ by a linear order $<_M$, also this class is partially ordered by $M_1 \subseteq M_2, M_1$ a sub-structure of M_2 .
 2) We say that $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ is existentially closed as in 0.1(2) and define $\mathbf{K}_\lambda^{\text{olf}}$ as in 0.1(3A).
 3) If $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ then we let $G_M = M$.

Remark 0.3. For $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ conceivably there is a symmetric dense $\mathfrak{S}$, hence a very natural canonical exlf-closure, without it we can either use a somewhat less natural one (see end of §1) or “make it symmetric by brute force” (see §3). But for the class $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ we can use only the first remedy, so every M has a canonical existentially closed extension, but it is more difficult to make it unique up to isomorphism. We shall in 6.1 introduce another class, $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$, locally finite groups with choice.

- Convention 0.4.** 1) Except in §6, $\mathbf{K}$ is the class $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ of locally finite groups or $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ of ordered locally finite groups (we may use $\leq_{\mathbf{K}}$ but here $\mathbf{K}$ is partially ordered by $\subseteq$, being a substructure) and see 0.3(2).
 2) Let xlf-group mean a member of $\mathbf{K}$. Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{ec}}$ be the class of existentially closed members of $\mathbf{K}$.
 3) In §2, §3, §4, §5 we use only $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$; in §1 you can restrict yourself $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ but in §6 we have further cases on which we may comment.

- Definition 0.5.** 1) For $M, N \in \mathbf{K}$ let $M \leq_{\text{fsb}} N$ mean that if $K \subseteq L$ are f.g., $K \subseteq M, L \subseteq N$, then there is an embedding of L into M over K .
 2) For $M, N \in \mathbf{K}$ let $M \leq_{\Sigma_1} N$ means that $M \subseteq N$ and if $\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}M, \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}N$ and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_{\mathbf{K}})$ is quantifier free and $N \models \varphi[\bar{b}, \bar{a}]$ then for some $\bar{b}' \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}M$ we have $M \models \varphi[\bar{b}', \bar{a}]$.
 3) Let $M_\ell \in \mathbf{K}, \bar{a}_\ell \in {}^{n(\ell)}(M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. We say that a relation on $M_1 \times M_2$ is quantifier-free definable in $(M_1, \bar{a}_1, M_2, \bar{a}_2)$ when it is a Boolean combination of finitely many simple ones, where R is a simple n -place relation on $M_1 \times M_2$ when it is the set of n -tuples $((b_0, c_0), \dots, (b_{n-1}, c_{n-1}))$ such that $b_i \in M_1, c_i \in M_2$ for $i < n$ and

$$M_1 \models \varphi_1[b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, \bar{a}_1]$$

$$M_2 \models \varphi_2[c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, \bar{a}_2]$$

for some quantifier-free formulas φ_1, φ_2 in $\mathbb{L}(\tau_{\mathbf{K}})$ and finite sequences $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2$ from M_1, M_2 respectively.

Remark 0.6. 1) Note 0.5(3) is not actually used, just indicate the form of definability used.

- 2) Note that $\leq_{\Sigma_1}$ for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ is the same as $\leq_{\text{fsb}}$. For other classes, see §6, if the vocabulary is finite and we deal with locally finite structures they are still the same. Otherwise, by our choice of “does not split” we have to use $\leq_{\text{fsb}}$. But if we prefer to use $\leq_{\Sigma_1}$ we have to strengthen the definition of “does not split” to make the proof of 1.19(1) work.

Convention 0.7. Let $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbf{K}, M_1 \subseteq M_2$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^n(M_2)$, so $\bar{a} = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$.

- 1) Denote by $cl(M_1 + \bar{a}, M_2)$ the closure of $M_1 \cup \bar{a} = M_1 \cup \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ in M_2 .
 2) Denote by $cl_{\text{gr}}(M_1 + \bar{a}, M_2)$ the closure of $M_1 \cup \{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ in M_2 as a group (usually the same as in part (1)).

3) For a group G and $A \subseteq G$ let

- $\text{Cm}_G(A) = \{g \in G : G \models "ag = ga" \text{ for every } a \in A\}$
- $\text{Cent}(G) = \text{Cm}_G(G)$
- $\text{nor}_G(A) = \{c \in G : c^{-1}Ac = A\}$.

4) For a group G , $\text{aut}(G)$ is the group of automorphisms of G and $\text{inner}(G)$ is the normal subgroup of $\text{aut}(G)$ consisting of the inner automorphism of G .

A side issue here is

Definition 0.8. 1) For a class $\mathbf{K}$ of structures (of a fixed vocabulary) we say $M \in \mathbf{K}$ is λ -universal in $\mathbf{K}$ when every $N \in \mathbf{K}$ of cardinality λ can be embedded into it.

2) We define $(\leq \lambda)$ -universal similarly.

3) We say $M \in \mathbf{K}$ is universal when it is λ -universal for $\lambda = \|M\|$.

4) Assume $\mathfrak{k} = (K_{\mathfrak{k}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{k}})$, $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ as a class of τ -structures (for some vocabulary $\tau = \tau_{\mathfrak{k}}$), closed under isomorphism, $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$ a partial order on $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ preserved under isomorphisms. Above “ $M \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ is λ -universal in $\mathfrak{k}$ ” means that if $N \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ has cardinality λ then there is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$ -embedding f of N into M , i.e. f is an isomorphism from N onto some $N' \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} M$. Similarly in the other variants.

This is connected to

Question 0.9. Fixing κ , what is $\sup\{\lambda^+ : \text{there is a sequence } \langle (G_{\alpha}, \bar{a}_{\alpha}) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ such that } G_{\alpha} \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}, \bar{a}_{\alpha} \in {}^{\kappa}(G_{\alpha}) \text{ and there are no } H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}} \text{ and } \alpha < \beta < \lambda \text{ and embedding } f_1, f_2 \text{ of } G_{\alpha}, G_{\beta} \text{ respectively into } H \text{ such that } f_1(\bar{a}_{\alpha}) = f_2(\bar{a}_{\beta})\}$.

§ 1. DEFINABLE TYPES

Convention 1.1. $G, H, \dots \in \mathbf{K}$.

Definition 1.2. For xlf-group $H, n < \omega$, a set $A \subseteq H$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^n H$ let $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, A, H) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, A, H)$ be the basic type of $\bar{a}$ in H over A , that is:

$$\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) : \begin{array}{l} \varphi \text{ is a basic (atomic or negation of atomic) formula in the variables} \\ \bar{x} = \langle x_\ell : \ell < n \rangle \text{ and the parameters } \bar{b}, \text{ a finite sequence from } A, \\ \text{which is satisfied by } \bar{a} \text{ in } H \end{array}\}$$

so without loss of generality φ is $\sigma(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) = e$ or $\sigma(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) \neq e$ for some group-term σ

so called “word”, (for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{of}}$ instead we have $\sigma_1(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) < \sigma_2(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$) but we may write $p(\bar{y}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}, A, H)$ or $p(\bar{z}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, A, H)$ or just p when the sequence variables are clear from the context.

2) We say $p(\bar{x})$ is an n -bs-type over G when it is a set of basic formulas in the variables $\bar{x} = \langle x_\ell : \ell < n \rangle$ and parameters from G , such that $p(\bar{x})$ is consistent, which means: if $K \subseteq G$ is f.g. and $q(\bar{x})$ is a finite subset of $p(\bar{x})$, $q(\bar{x})$ is over K (i.e. all the parameters appearing in $q(\bar{x})$ are from K) then $q(\bar{x})$ is realized in some $L \in \mathbf{K}$ extending K . We say $\bar{a}$ realizes p in H if $G \subseteq H$ and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) \in p \Rightarrow H \models \varphi[\bar{a}, \bar{b}]$.
3) $\mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(G) = \{\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, G, H) : G \subseteq H, H \text{ is from } \mathbf{K}, \bar{a} \in {}^n H\}$.

Observation 1.3. For every $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ and $M \in \mathbf{K}$ there are $N, \bar{a}$ such that $M \subseteq N \in \mathbf{K}, \bar{a} \in {}^n N$ realizes $p, G_N = \text{cl}(G_M + \bar{a}, N)$ and if $M \subseteq N' \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{a}'$ realizes p in N' then there is $N'' \subseteq N'$ and an isomorphism f from N onto N'' extending id_M such that $f(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}'$.

Remark 1.4. 0) In 1.3 we use the convention of 0.2(1),(3).

1) We are particularly interested in types which are definable in some sense over small sets.

2) We can define “ $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ ” syntactically, because for a set p of basic formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}), \bar{a}$ from M which is complete (i.e. if $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ is an atomic formula over M then $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p$ or $\neg\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p$), we have $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ iff for every f.g. $N \subseteq M$ we have $p \upharpoonright N := \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p : \bar{a} \subseteq N\} \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(N)$.

3) Why do we use below types which do not split over a finite subgroup and the related set of schemes? As we like to get a canonical extension of $M \in \mathbf{K}$ it is natural to use set of types closed under automorphism of M , and as their number is preferably $\leq \|M\|$, it is natural that is such type, in some sense, definable over some finite subset of M .

As in [Sh:3]

Definition 1.5. We say that $p = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, G, H) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(G)$ does not split over $K \subseteq G$ when for every $m < \omega$ and $\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2 \in {}^m G$ satisfying $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_1, K, G) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_2, K, G)$ we have $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}, K, H) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_2 \hat{\ } \bar{a}, K, H)$.

Definition 1.6. 1) Let $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{K}) = \bigcup_n \mathbf{D}_n(\mathbf{K})$, where $\mathbf{D}_n(\mathbf{K}) = \{\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, \emptyset, M) : \bar{a} \in {}^n M \text{ and } M \in \mathbf{K}\}$.

- 2) Assume¹ $p(\bar{x}) \subseteq p'(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{D}_k(\mathbf{K})$ and $m < \omega$. We let $\mathbf{D}_{p(\bar{x}),m}(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{D}_m(p(\bar{x}), \mathbf{K})$ be the set of $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbf{D}_{k+m}(\mathbf{K})$ such that $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \upharpoonright k \supseteq p(\bar{x})$ which means that there is $M \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^k M$ realizing $p(\bar{x})$ and $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ realizing $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ in M , i.e. $\ell g(\bar{a}) = k, \ell g(\bar{b}) = m$ and $\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}$ realizes $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$.
- 3) In part (2) let $\mathbf{D}_{p(\bar{x})}(\mathbf{K}) = \cup \{ \mathbf{D}_m(p(\bar{x}), \mathbf{K}) : m < \omega \}$.

Remark 1.7. Below $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}_{n,k}$ is a scheme to fully define a type $p(\bar{z}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ for a given parameter $\bar{a} \in {}^k M$ such that $p(\bar{z})$ does not split over $\bar{a}$. Sometimes $\mathfrak{s}$ is not unique but if, e.g. $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ it is.

Definition 1.8. 1) Let $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ be $\cup \{ \Omega_{n,k}[\mathbf{K}] : k, n < \omega \}$ where $\Omega_{n,k}[\mathbf{K}]$ is the set of schemes $\mathfrak{s}$ which means for some $p(\bar{x}) = p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ with $\ell g(\bar{x}) = k$, (and $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = k(\mathfrak{s}) = k, n_{\mathfrak{s}} = n(\mathfrak{s}) = n$) we have:

- (a) $\mathfrak{s}$ is a function with domain $\mathbf{D}_{p(\bar{x})}(\mathbf{K})$ such that for each m it maps $\mathbf{D}_{p(\bar{x}),m}(\mathbf{K})$ into $\mathbf{D}_{k+m+n}(\mathbf{K})$
- (b) if $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbf{D}_{p(\bar{x}),m}(\mathbf{K})$ and $r(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) = \mathfrak{s}(q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$ then $r(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \upharpoonright (k+m) = q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$; that is, if $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$, i.e. $\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b} \hat{\ } \bar{c}$ realizes $r(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ in $M \in \mathbf{K}$ so $k = \ell g(\bar{a}), m = \ell g(\bar{b}), n = \ell g(\bar{c})$, then $\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}$ realizes $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ in M
- (c) in clause (b), moreover if $\bar{b}' \in {}^{\omega} M$, $\text{Rang}(\bar{b}') \subseteq \text{Rang}(\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b})$ then $\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}' \hat{\ } \bar{c}$ realizes the type $\mathfrak{s}(\text{tp}(\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}', \emptyset, M))$; this is to avoid $\mathfrak{s}$'s which define contradictory types².

- 2) Assume $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega_{n,k}[\mathbf{K}]$ and $M \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^k M$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$; we let $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M)$ be the unique $r(\bar{z}) = r(\bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ such that for any $\bar{b} \in {}^{\omega} M$ letting $r_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) := \mathfrak{s}(\text{tp}(\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}, \emptyset, M))$ we have $r_{\bar{b}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{z}) \subseteq r(\bar{z})$.

- 3) We call $\mathfrak{s}$ full when $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{D}_{k(\mathfrak{s})}(\mathbf{K})$.

- 4) For technical reasons we allow $\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \langle x_{\mathfrak{s},\ell} : \ell \in u \rangle, u \subseteq \mathbb{N}, |u| = k_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and ${}^{k(\mathfrak{s})} M$ will mean $\{ \langle a_{\ell} : \ell \in u \rangle : a_{\ell} \in M \text{ for } \ell \in u \}$ and we do not pedantically distinguish between u and k . Similarly for $n_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\bar{z}$, the reason is 1.10, 1.15(4).

Convention 1.9. $\mathfrak{S}$ will denote a subset of $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$.

Definition 1.10. 1) For $G \in \mathbf{K}$ let $\text{def}(G)$ be the set of pairs $t = (\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) = (\mathfrak{s}_t, \bar{a}_t)$ such that $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega} G$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ and let $q_t(G) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_t}(\bar{a}_t, G)$ and $p_t(\bar{x}_t) = p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}), k(t) = k(\mathfrak{s}), n(t) = n(\mathfrak{s})$. For $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega(\mathbf{K})$ let $\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$ be the set of $t \in \text{def}(G)$ such that $\mathfrak{s}_t \in \mathfrak{S}$.

- 2) We say $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ are disjoint when $\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_1}, \bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}$ are disjoint as well as $\bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_1}, \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}$. Similarly for $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$.

- 3) We say $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ are congruent, written $\mathfrak{s}_1 \equiv \mathfrak{s}_2$ when we get $\mathfrak{s}_2$ from $\mathfrak{s}_1$ by replacing $\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_1}, \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_1}$ by other sequences of variables, $\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}, \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}$ (again with no repetitions, of the same length respectively, of course), similarly for $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$, (the aim is to be able to get disjoint congruent copies; we do not always remember to replace a scheme by congruent copies).

- 4) We say $\mathfrak{S}$ is invariant when if $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ are congruent then $\mathfrak{s}_1 \in \mathfrak{S} \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$.

¹this is used to define the set $\mathfrak{S}$ of schemes; for this section the case $p(\bar{x}) = p'(\bar{x})$ is enough as we can consider all the completions but the general version is more natural in counting a set $\mathfrak{S}$ of schemes and in considering actual examples

²but some $\mathfrak{s}$'s failing this may give a consistent type in an interesting class of cases, see [Sh:F1120, §4]

5) The invariant closure of $\mathfrak{S}$ is defined naturally (and $|\mathfrak{S}|$ will mean up to congruency); if not said otherwise we use invariant $\mathfrak{S}$.

6) We define the (equivalence) relation $\approx_G$ on $\text{def}(G)$ by $t_1 \approx_G t_2$ iff $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$ and $q_{t_1}(G) = q_{t_2}(G)$.

Claim 1.11. 1) If $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega_{n,k}[\mathbf{K}]$ and $M \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{a} \in {}^k M$ then indeed $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ so exist and is unique, see Definition 1.8(2); if $\bar{a}$ is empty, i.e. $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 0$ we may write $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$.

2) Assume $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$ and $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$ or just $G \leq_{\Sigma_1} H \in \mathbf{K}$. If $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$ then $q_{t_1}(G) = q_{t_2}(G)$ iff $q_{t_1}(H) = q_{t_2}(H)$.

3) Let $K \subseteq M \in \mathbf{K}$, M is existentially closed or just every $r \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^{<\omega}(K)$ is realized in M , K is finite, and $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$.

The type p does not split over K iff there are $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ and a finite sequence $\bar{a}$ from K (even listing K) realizing $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x})$ such that $p = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M)$.

4) If $G \subseteq H$, $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$, $\bar{a} \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s})}G$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ and $\bar{c} \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s})}H$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G)$ in H and $\sigma(\bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}}, \bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ is a group-term then $\sigma^H(\bar{c}, \bar{a}) \in G \Rightarrow \sigma^H(\bar{c}, \bar{a}) \in \text{cl}(\bar{a}, G)$.

Proof. Easy by the definition. (Part (4) - by disjoint amalgamation of finite groups.)

□_{1.11}

Example 1.12. There is $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ such that: $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 0, n_{\mathfrak{s}} = 1$ and $a \in H$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(<>, G_1)$ when $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $a \in H \setminus G$ has order 2 and commute with every member of G .

Definition 1.13. 1) For $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ we define the two place relation $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ on $\mathbf{K}$ as follows: $M \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} N$ iff $M \subseteq N$ (and they belong to $\mathbf{K}$) and for every $n < \omega$ and $\bar{c} \in {}^n N$ we can find $k < \omega$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^k M$ and $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}) \subseteq \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, \emptyset, M) \in \mathbf{D}_k(\mathbf{K})$ and $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, M, N) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M)$ so $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$.

2) For $M \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}]$ let

$$(a) \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(M) = \{q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M) : \mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S} \text{ satisfies } n_{\mathfrak{s}} = n \text{ and } \bar{a} \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s})}M \text{ realizes } p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})\}$$

$$(b) \text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(M) = \{t \in \text{def}(M) : \mathfrak{s}_t \in \mathfrak{S}\}.$$

3) We say $M \in \mathbf{K}$ is $\mathfrak{S}$ -existentially closed when for every $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$, finite³ $G \subseteq M$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}G$ realizing $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x})$ the type $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G)$ is realized in M ; (this is equivalently existentially closed if $\mathfrak{S}$ is dense, see Definition 1.15(2) below).

Definition 1.14. We say $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is symmetric when : if $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$, $M \subseteq N$ are from $\mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{c}_{\ell} \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s}_{\ell})}N$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_{\ell}}(\bar{a}_{\ell}, M)$ in N (so $\bar{a}_{\ell} \in {}^{m(\mathfrak{s}_{\ell})}M$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}_{\ell}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_{\ell}})$) and $M_{\ell} = \text{cl}(M + \bar{c}_{\ell}, N) \subseteq N$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $\bar{c}_1$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_1}(\bar{a}_1, M_2)$ in N iff $\bar{c}_2$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_2}(\bar{a}_2, M_1)$ in N .

Definition 1.15. 1) We say $\mathfrak{S}$ is closed when it is dominating-closed and composition-closed, see below and invariant of course.

1A) $\mathfrak{S}$ is composition-closed when if $H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq H_2 \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{a}_{\ell} \in {}^{n(\ell)}(H_{\ell})$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_{\ell+1}, H_{\ell}, H_{\ell+1}) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_{\ell}}(\bar{a}_{\ell}, H_{\ell}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{n(\ell+1)}(H_{\ell})$ and $H_{\ell+1} = \text{cl}(H_{\ell} + \bar{a}_{\ell}, H_{\ell+1})$, $\mathfrak{s}_{\ell} \in \mathfrak{S}$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2, H_0, H_2) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_0, H_0)$ for some $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S} \cap \Omega_{n(1)+n(2), n(0)}[\mathbf{K}]$.

1B) $\mathfrak{S}$ is dominating-closed when: if $H_0 \subseteq H_1 \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{a}_1 \in {}^{\omega>}(H_0)$, $\bar{c}_1 \in {}^{n(1)}(H_1)$, $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_1, H_0, H_1) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_1, H_0) \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(H_0)$ and $\bar{c}_2 \in {}^{n(2)}(H_1)$ and $\bar{a}_2 \in {}^{\omega>}(H_0)$,

³for general $\mathbf{K}$: we use finitely generated $G \subseteq M$; generally this change is needed

$\text{Rang}(\bar{a}_2) \supseteq \text{Rang}(\bar{a}_1), \bar{c}_2 \subseteq \text{cl}(\bar{a}_2 + \bar{c}_1, H_1)$ then $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_2, H_0, H_1) = q_s(\bar{a}_2, H_0)$ for some $s \in \mathfrak{S}$.

2) We say $\mathfrak{S}$ is weakly dense when: for every $G_0 \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}, G_0 \subseteq G_1 \in \mathbf{K}, G_0, G_1$ are finite and $\bar{c} \in {}^n(G_1)$ there is $p(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(H)$ which extends $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G_0, G_1)$.

3) We say $\mathfrak{S}$ is strongly dense when in part (2), $p(\bar{z}) = q_s(\bar{a}, H)$ for some $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $\bar{a}$ from G_0 . Let dense mean weakly dense (but the existence proofs give the strong version).

4) For disjoint $s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$ define $s = s_1 \oplus s_2$ with $p_s(\bar{x}_s) = p_{s_1}(\bar{x}_{s_1}) \cup p_{s_2}(\bar{x}_{s_2})$ recalling $\bar{x}_{s_1}, \bar{x}_{s_2}$ are disjoint such that: if $G_0 \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2$ are from $\mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{a}_1 \in {}^{k(s_1)}G_0, \bar{a}_2 \in {}^{k(s_2)}G_0, \bar{a}_\ell$ realizes $p_{s_\ell}(\bar{x}_{s_\ell})$ in $G_0 \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{c}_\ell \in {}^{n(s_\ell)}(G_{\ell+1})$ realizes $q_{s_\ell}(\bar{a}_\ell, G_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $\bar{c}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{c}_2$ realizes $q_s(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2, G_0)$ in G_2 .

4A) For (disjoint) $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$ we define $t_1 \oplus t_2 = t_1 \oplus_G t_2$ similarly.

4B) We define $\bigoplus_{k < m} s_k, \bigoplus_{k < m} t_k$ similarly using associativity, see 1.17(5).

5) We say that $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is compact when: if $s_\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}$ for $\alpha < \delta, \langle G_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is increasing continuous (δ a limit ordinal) $\bar{a}_\alpha \in {}^{\omega}G_0$ is finite and $q_\alpha = q_{s_\alpha}(\bar{a}, G_\alpha) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(G_\alpha)$ for $\alpha < \delta$, satisfies $\alpha < \beta < \delta \Rightarrow q_\alpha \subseteq q_\beta$ then for some $s_\delta \in \mathfrak{S}$ we have $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow q_\alpha \subseteq s_\delta(\bar{a}, G_\delta)$.

6) Let $s_1 \leq s_2$ means: if $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}, \bar{a}_2 \in {}^{k(s_2)}G$ realizes $p_{s_2}(\bar{x}_{s_2}), G \subseteq H, \bar{c}_2 \in {}^{n(s_2)}H$ realizes $q_{s_2}(\bar{a}_2, G)$ then $\bar{c}_2 \upharpoonright n(s_2)$ realizes $q_{s_1}(\bar{a}_2 \upharpoonright k(s_1), G)$ and $p_{s_2}(\bar{x}_{s_2}) \upharpoonright \bar{x}_{s_1} = p_{s_1}(\bar{x}_{s_1})$.

7) Let $s_1 \leq_{\bar{h}} s_2$ means that $\bar{h} = (h', h''), h'$ is a function from $\text{dom}(\bar{x}_{s_1})$ into $\text{dom}(\bar{x}_{s_2})$ and h'' is a function from $\text{dom}(\bar{z}_{s_1})$ into $\text{dom}(\bar{z}_{s_2})$ such that: if $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_2, G, H) = q_{s_2}(\bar{a}_2, G)$ and $\bar{a}_1 = \langle a_{2, h''(\ell)} : \ell \in \text{dom}(\bar{a}_1) \rangle$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \langle c_{2, h(\ell)} : \ell \in \text{dom}(\bar{c}_2) \rangle$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_1, G, H) = q_{s_1}(\bar{a}_1, G, H)$. Similarly $t_1 \leq_{\bar{h}} t_2$ for $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$. If $h' \cup h''$ is well defined we may write $h' \cup h''$ instead of $\bar{h}$.

Remark 1.16. 0) Concerning 1.15(7) the point of disjoint s_1, s_2 and congruency is to avoid using this. So we may ignore it as well as 1.18(2), (3), 3.4(3), 3.5(4), 3.6(5).

1) Note that the operation $s_1 \oplus s_2$ is not necessarily commutative, e.g. for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{of}}$ it cannot be.

2) In e.g. Definition 1.15(2), apparently s is not uniquely determined by the relevant information (s and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2 \hat{\ } \bar{c}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{c}_2, \emptyset, H_1)$ and the lengths of $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2$) but if H_1 is existentially closed, it is. We could have written the definition in a computational form.

3) In the cases central here, “ $\mathfrak{S}$ compact” from Definition 1.15(5), fail.

4) So $s_1 \leq s_2$ means $s_1 \leq_{\bar{h}} s_2$ with h_ℓ the identity.

Definition/Claim 1.17. 1) For any $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ we can define its closure as the minimal closed (invariant, of course) $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ which includes it; we denote it by $\text{cl}(\mathfrak{S}) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{S}; \mathbf{K})$.

2) Similarly for dominating-closure $\text{docl}(\mathfrak{S})$ and composition-closure $\text{cocl}(\mathfrak{S})$.

3) Those closures preserve symmetry and density (and being invariant), and the obvious closure properties.

4) Also dominating-closure preserve being composition closed.

5) The operation $\oplus$ on $\mathfrak{S}$ is well defined and associative; symmetry means that it is commutative (when defined). Similarly for $\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$.

6) $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ has cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$; generally $\leq 2^{|\tau(\mathbf{K})| + \aleph_0}$.

7) $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is a transitive relation on $\mathbf{K}$ if $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is closed.

8) If $H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq H_2$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, H_1, H_2) = q_s(\bar{a}, H_1)$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{k(s)}H_0$ then $\text{Rang}(\bar{c}) \cap H_1 = \text{Rang}(\bar{c}) \cap H_0$.

9) If $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{n-1}$ and $i(0) < \dots i(k) < n$ and $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s}_{i(0)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{i(k-1)}$ then $\mathfrak{s}' \leq \mathfrak{s}$.

Proof. Natural, noting that (8) is specific for our present $\mathbf{K}$, see 1.11(4). $\square_{1.17}$

Claim 1.18. 1) The operation $\oplus$ on disjoint pairs from $\text{def}(G)$ respects congruency, see Definition 1.10(3). If $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ then $(\mathfrak{s}_1 / \equiv) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}_2 / \equiv)$ is well defined, i.e. if $\mathfrak{s}'_\ell, \mathfrak{s}''_\ell$ are congruent to $\mathfrak{s}_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s}'_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}'_2, \mathfrak{s}'' = \mathfrak{s}''_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}''_2$ are well defined (equivalently for $\ell = 1, 2$ the two schemes $\mathfrak{s}'_\ell, \mathfrak{s}''_\ell$ are disjoint) then $\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{s}''$ are congruent. (So we may forget to be pedantic about this.)

2) If $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) = (\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \oplus_G (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2)$ then $(\bar{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \leq_{h_\ell} (\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a})$ for the natural h_ℓ .

3) If in $\text{def}(G)$ we have $(\mathfrak{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \leq_{h_\ell} (\mathfrak{s}'_\ell, \bar{a}'_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\text{Dom}(h_1) \cap \text{Dom}(h_2) = \emptyset$, $\text{Rang}(h_1) \cap \text{Rang}(h_2) = \emptyset$ then $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2) \leq_{h_1 \cup h_2} (\mathfrak{s}'_1, \bar{a}'_1) \oplus (\mathfrak{s}'_2, \bar{a}'_2)$.

Proof. Straight. $\square$

Claim 1.19. Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is dominating-closed and $G_0 \subseteq G_1 \in \mathbf{K}$ and $G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_2$ and for transparency $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$ and⁴ $G_0 \leq_{\Sigma_1} G_2$ (holds if G_0 is existentially closed in $\mathbf{K}$).

1) There is $G_3 \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $G_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_3$ and $G_2 \subseteq G_3$ and $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$.

2) G_3 above is unique up to isomorphism over $G_1 \cup G_2$.

3) We have $G_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G$.

4) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric and $G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_1$ in part (1) then also $G_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_3$.

Proof. Straight, e.g.

1) Let $\bar{c} = \langle c_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*) \rangle$ list the elements of G_2 , and for every finite $u \subseteq \alpha(*)$ let $\bar{x}_u = \langle x_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$ and $p_u^0(\bar{x}_u) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}|u, G_0, G_2)$ hence by assumption, there is $\mathfrak{s}_u \in \mathfrak{S}$ (up to congruency) and $\bar{a}_u \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s}_u)}(G_0)$ such that $p_u^0(\bar{x}) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_u}(\bar{a}_u, G_0)$. We define $p_u^1(\bar{x}_u) \in \mathbf{S}(G_1)$ as $q_{\mathfrak{s}_u}(\bar{a}_u, G_1)$. We define G_3 as a group extending G_1 generated by $G_1 \cup \{c_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\}$ such that $\bar{c}|u$ realizes $p_u^1(\bar{x}_u)$ for every finite $u \subseteq \alpha(*)$. But for this to work we have to prove that for finite $u \subseteq v \subseteq \alpha(*)$ we have $p_u^1(\bar{x}_u) \subseteq p_v^1(\bar{x}_v)$. This is straight recalling 1.11(2). $\square_{1.19}$

Remark 1.20. 1) We may consider an alternative definition.

$G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H$ iff for every finite $A \subseteq H$ for some $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega}H, \bar{a} \in {}^{\omega}G$ and $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$ we have: $\bar{a}$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$, $\bar{c}$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G)$ in H and $A \subseteq \text{Rang}(\bar{c})$.

2) But then to prove $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is transitive we need a stronger version of composition-closed: if $G_0 \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2$ and for $\ell = 0, 1, \bar{c}_\ell \in {}^{n(\ell)}(G_{\ell+1})$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}(\bar{a}_\ell, G_\ell)$ and $\text{Rang}(\bar{b}_0) \subseteq \text{Rang}(\bar{a}_1)$ then for some $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}, p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}) = p_{\mathfrak{s}_0}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_0})$ and $\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_0, G_0)$.

3) In any case for closed $\mathfrak{S}$ the two definitions are equivalent.

4) Does the operation $\oplus_G$ respect $\approx_G$, see Definition 1.10 i.e. if $t_1 \approx_G t'_1$ and $t_2 \approx_G t'_2$ then $t_1 \oplus_G t_2 \approx_G t'_1 \oplus_G t'_2$? Assuming the operations are well defined, of course. We do not see a reason for this to hold.

* * *

Before we present the more systematic way from [Sh:c, Ch.IV] we give a direct definition and proof for a canonical existentially closed extension of $G \in \mathbf{K}$ when $\mathfrak{S}$

⁴If $G_2 = \langle G_0 \cup A \rangle$, A finite then for part (1) this is not necessary.

is symmetric, i.e. the “second avenue” in §0B. We shall deal with the non-symmetric case later.

Definition 1.21. Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is symmetric.

- 1) We say H is a $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure of G when there is a sequence $\langle G_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $G_0 = G$, $H = \bigcup \{G_n : n < \omega\}$ and G_{n+1} is a one-step $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure of G_n , see below.
- 2) We say that H is a one-step $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure of G when:

- (a) $G \subseteq H$ are from $\mathbf{K}$
- (b) $S := \text{def}(G) = \{(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) : \mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S} \text{ and } \bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}G \text{ realizes } p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})\}$ and let $t = (\mathfrak{s}_t, \bar{a}_t) = (\mathfrak{s}(t), \bar{a}(t))$ for $t \in S$
- (c) $\bar{c}_t \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s}(t))}H$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_t}(\bar{a}_t, G)$ for $t \in S$
- (d) H is generated by $\{\bar{c}_t : t \in S\} \cup G$
- (e) $\bar{c}_t$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_t}(\bar{c}_t, \langle \bigcup \{\bar{c}_s : s \in S \setminus \{t\}\} \cup G \rangle_H)$ for every $t \in S$.

Claim 1.22. Let $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ be symmetric.

- 1) For every $G \in \mathbf{K}$ there is a one-step $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure H of G .
- 2) For every $G \in \mathbf{K}$ there is an $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure H of G .
- 3) In both parts (1) and (2) we have $|G| \leq |H| \leq |G| + |\mathfrak{S}| + \aleph_0$.
- 4) In both parts (1) and (2), H is unique up to isomorphism over G .
- 5) If (G_ℓ, H_ℓ) are as in part (1) or part (2) for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ then H_1 can be embedded into H_2 over G_1 .
- 6) In both parts (1) and (2) there is a set theoretic class function $\mathbf{F}$ computing H from G , pedantically for every $G \in \mathbf{K}$ and ordinal α not in the transitive closure of $\text{tr} - \text{cl}(G)$ of G , $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(G)$ is H as required such that: if $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \wedge G_2 \cap \mathbf{F}_\alpha(G_1) = G_1 \wedge \alpha \notin \text{tr} - \text{cl}'(G)$ then $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(G_1) \subseteq \mathbf{F}_\alpha(G_2)$; this is “naturalness”.
- 7) In fact we do not have to use the axiom of choice.

Proof. Should be clear (alternatively, below we do more). □_{1.22}

Remark 1.23. Similarly in §3.

Definition 1.24. 1) We say N is $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -full over M when: $M \subseteq N$ and if $M \subseteq M_1 \subseteq N$ and $M_1 = \text{cl}(M + A, N)$ for some $A \subseteq M_1$ of cardinality $< \lambda$ and $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s})}M_1$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ in M_1 then $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, M_1)$ is realized in N .
 2) We may write “ $\mathfrak{S}$ -full when $\lambda = \|N\|$ ”.

Claim 1.25. Let $\mathfrak{S}$ be symmetric.

- 1) If $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{K})$ is closed (see 1.15(1)) then $(\mathbf{K}, \leq_{\mathfrak{S}})$ satisfies most of the demands for being an a.e.c. with amalgamation⁵ (even canonical), see [Sh:88r] or [Sh:h, Ch.I], but $\text{LST}(\mathbf{K}, \leq_{\mathfrak{S}})$ may be ∞ and we omit $\text{Ax}(\text{III})_2$, see 1.27 below.
- 2) If $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is dense and closed (see 1.15) then for every $M \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda$ there is existentially closed $N \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda$ which $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -extends it, in fact any $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure of M can serve.
- 3) If N is $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -full over M_1 and $M_0 \subseteq M_1$, then N is $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -closed over M_0 ; also in Definition 1.24 without loss of generality $\bar{a}$ is from A .

Proof. 1) Easy.

2) Easy by 1.22 and see 1.22 and more below.

3) Easy. □_{1.25}

⁵not enough for quoting results

Discussion 1.26. So if there is a symmetric closed dense $\mathfrak{S}$ then for every lf group G there is a “nice” extension $\hat{G} = G_{\lambda}^{\mathcal{A}}$ to a existentially closed one.

Discussion 1.27. For 1.25(1) if we assume $\langle G_{\alpha} : \alpha \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous and $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow G_{\alpha} \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_{\delta+1}$, does it follow that $G_{\delta} \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_{\delta+1}$? This is Ax(III)_2 of the definition of a.e.c. Well, if δ has uncountable cofinality and each G_{α} is existentially closed yes. The point is that the relevant types do not split over finite sets. If we deal with “not split over countable sets” we need $\text{cf}(\delta) \geq \aleph_2$, etc.

So $(\mathbf{K}, \leq_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is not an a.e.c. in general failing Ax(III)_2 ; in fact, e.g. we may prove for the maximal $\mathfrak{S}$ that this is the case, see the proof of 5.1.

Now we turn to construction not necessarily assuming “ $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric” presenting the “first avenue” in §0(B).

Definition 1.28. 1) We say that $\mathcal{A} = \langle G_i, \bar{a}_j, w_j, K_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is an $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction (for $\mathbf{K}$) when :

- (a) G_i for $i \leq \alpha$ is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -increasing continuous sequence of members of $\mathbf{K}$
- (b) G_{i+1} is generated by $G_i \cup \{\bar{a}_i\}$, $\bar{a}_i$ a finite sequence
- (c) w_i is a finite subset of i
- (d) $K_i \subseteq G_i$ is finite
- (d)⁺ moreover $K_i \subseteq \langle G_0 + \sum_{j \in w_i} \bar{a}_j \rangle_{G_i}$
- (e) $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_i, G_i, G_{i+1}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{lg}(\bar{a}_i)}(G_i)$ as witnessed by K_i , i.e. is $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_i)$ for some $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega}K_i$ realizing $p_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for some $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$.

2) We may say above that G_{α} is $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -constructible over G_0 ; and also that $\mathcal{A}$ is an $\mathfrak{S}$ -construction over G_0 , we let $\alpha = \text{lg}(\mathcal{A})$, $G_i = G_i^{\mathcal{A}}$, $\bar{a}_i = \bar{a}_i^{\mathcal{A}}$, $w_j = w_j^{\mathcal{A}}$, $K_j = K_j^{\mathcal{A}}$.

3) We say above that $\mathcal{A}$ is a definite $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction when for every $j < \alpha$ we have also $t_j = t_j^{\mathcal{A}} \in \text{def}(G_j^{\mathcal{A}})$ such that $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega}(K_j)$ and $\bar{a}_j$ realizes $q_{t_j}(G_j)$ (so every $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction can be expanded to a definite one, but not necessarily uniquely).

4) We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a λ -full definite $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction when α is divisible by λ and for every $i < \alpha$ and $t \in \text{def}(G_i)$, the set $\{j : j \in (i, \alpha) \text{ and } t_j^{\mathcal{A}} = t\}$ is an unbounded subset of $\alpha(*)$ of order type divisible by λ .

Discussion 1.29. 1) We may replace 1.28(1)(e) by “ $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_i, G_i, G_{i+1})$ does not split over K_i ”, this is like the case $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}}$. We gain Ax(VI) in 1.31, see below, but we lose:

- (*) if $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}$ is a $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction and $G_0^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq G$ and $G \cap G_{\text{lg}(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}} = G_0^{\mathcal{A}}$ then for some $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction $\mathcal{B}$ with $G_0^{\mathcal{B}} = G$, $\text{lg}(\mathcal{B}) = \text{lg}(\mathcal{A})$ and $G_{\text{lg}(\mathcal{B})}^{\mathcal{B}} = \langle G_{\text{lg}(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}} \cup G \rangle_{G_{\text{lg}(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}}}$.

1A) For the definite version, see 1.28(3), we get even uniqueness in (*).

2) We may consider (see [Sh:f, Ch.IV, §1]).

Ax(V.1): If $(q, G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$, $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$; $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^{\omega}H$; $q = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}, G, H)$ and $p = \text{tp}(\bar{a}, \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_{H, H})$ then $(p, \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_{H, H}, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

Ax(V.2): A notational variant of (V1) so ignore.

Claim 1.30. 1) If $G = M \in \mathbf{K}$ is of cardinality $\leq \lambda$ and $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is closed and dense and of cardinality $\leq \lambda$ (if $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ this follows) then there is a $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction $\mathcal{A}$ such that

- (a) $\alpha^{\mathcal{A}} = \lambda$
- (b) $G_0^{\mathcal{A}} = G$
- (c) $G_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ec}}$ is exlf of cardinality λ
- (d) $\mathcal{A}$ is λ -full, that is for every $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s})}(G_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ realizing $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x})$, for λ ordinals $\alpha < \lambda$ we have: $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_\alpha, G_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}, G_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{A}}) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}})$.

2) Assume $\lambda \geq \|M\| + |\mathfrak{S}|$ is regular. Then we can find $N \in \mathbf{K}_\lambda$ which is $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -constructible over M , is $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -full over M and is embeddable over M into any N' which is $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -full over M , in fact G_λ from part (1) is as required.

3) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric and is closed and N_1, N_2 are $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -constructible over M and $(\mathfrak{S}, \lambda)$ -full over M and of cardinality λ then N_1, N_2 are isomorphic over M .

4) If $\lambda \geq \|M\|$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is an $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^{\text{sch}} - \mathfrak{S}$ -construction of N over M and $\text{lg}(\mathcal{A}) = \lambda$ then for every $N' \in \mathbf{K}$ which is λ -full over M , we have N is embeddable into N' over M .

Proof. By [Sh:c, Ch.VI,§3] as all the relevant axioms there apply (see below or [Sh:c, Ch.IV,§1,pg.153]) or just check directly. Of course, we can use a monster $\mathfrak{C}$ for groups, but use only sets A such that $\text{cl}(A) = \langle A \rangle_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is locally finite, and we use quantifier-free types. $\square_{1.30}$

Now we make the connection to [Sh:c, Ch.IV].

Definition/Claim 1.31. 1) Let $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ be closed and let $\lambda = \lambda(\mathbf{F}_{\mathfrak{S}})$ be $\aleph_0$. Then $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is defined as the set of triples (p, G, A) such that A is finite, for some $B \subseteq G \in \mathbf{K}$ we have $A \subseteq B, \text{cl}(B) = \text{cl}(B, G) \subseteq G$ hence $\in \mathbf{K}$, $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{<\omega}(\text{cl}(B))$ is $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{b}, \text{cl}(B))$ for some $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}, \bar{b} \subseteq \text{cl}(B)$ over A ; we may restrict ourselves to $B = \text{cl}(B, G)$; note: as here we do not have a monster model $\mathfrak{C}$ we can either demand $B \in \mathbf{K}$ or demand $B \subseteq G \in \mathbf{K}$ but then it is more natural to write (p, G, A) instead of (p, A) .

2) $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies the axioms (written below in the present notation) except possibly V, VI, VIII, X.1, X.2, XI.1, XI.2.

3) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric then $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies also Ax(VI).

4) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is dense then $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies also Ax(X.1).

5) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is compact (see 1.15(5)), then $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies Ax(VIII).

Proof. Isomorphism - Ax(I): preservation under isomorphism

Obvious.

Trivially $\mathbf{F}$ -types

Ax(III): If $L \subseteq G \in \mathbf{K}, |L| < \lambda, \bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}L$ and $p = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, G)$ then $(p, G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? Trivially; recall $\lambda = \aleph_0$.]

Axiom(II2)-(II3)-(II4): irrelevant here.

Monotonicity

Ax(III1): If $L \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2$ and $(p, G_2, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ then $(p \upharpoonright G_1, G_1, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? As if $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}L, L \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2 \in \mathbf{K}$ and $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_2)$ is well defined then $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_1) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_2) \upharpoonright G_1$).

Ax(III2): If $L \subseteq L_1 \subseteq G$, $|L_1| < \lambda$ and $(p, G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ then $(p, G, L_1) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? By the definition.]

Ax(IV): If $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^{\omega>}H$, $L \subseteq G \subseteq H$, $(\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}, G, H), G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ and $\text{Rang}(\bar{a}) \subseteq \text{Rang}(\bar{b})$ then $(\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, G, H), G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? Straight as $\mathfrak{S}$ is domination closed.]

Transitivity and symmetry:

Ax(VI): (If $\mathfrak{S}$ is symmetric). If $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^{\omega>}H$, $L_1, L_2 \subseteq G$ finite and $(\text{tp}(\bar{b}, \langle G + \bar{a} \rangle_H, \langle G + \bar{a} \rangle_H, L_1) \in \mathbf{F}$ and $(\text{tp}(\bar{a}, G, H), G, L_2) \in \mathbf{F}$ then $(\text{tp}(\bar{a}, \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_H, \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_H, L_1) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? By $\mathfrak{S}$ being symmetric.]

Ax(VII): If $G \subseteq H \subseteq \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^{\omega>}H$, $(\text{tp}(\bar{a}, \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_H, H), \langle G + \bar{b} \rangle_H, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ and $(\text{tp}(\bar{b}, G, H), G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ then $(\text{tp}(\bar{a} \hat{\ } \bar{b}, G, H), G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? By $\mathfrak{S}$ being composition-closed.]

Continuity:

Ax(VIII) when $\mathfrak{S}$ is compact: If $\langle G_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous in $\mathbf{K}$, $L \subseteq G_0$ finite $p \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G_\lambda)$ and $i < \delta \Rightarrow (p \upharpoonright G_i, G_i, L) \in \mathbf{F}$ then $(p, G_\delta, L) \in \mathbf{F}$.

[Why? By the Definition 1.15(5); also holds when $\text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$.]

Ax(IX): irrelevant as $\lambda = \aleph_0$.

Existence:

Ax(X.1): If $L_1 \subseteq G \in \mathbf{K}$, $L_1 \subseteq L_2$ finite, $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}(L_2)$ then for some p extending $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, L_1, L_2)$ and finite $L \subseteq G$ we have $(p, G, L) \in \mathbf{F}$, moreover without loss of generality $L = L_1$.

[Why? By $\mathfrak{S}$ being dense.]

Ax(X.2): irrelevant and follows by the moreover in Ax(X.1).

Ax(XI.1): If $p \in \mathbf{S}(G_1)$, $(p, G_2, L) \in \mathbf{F}$, $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ then there is $q \in \mathbf{S}(G_2)$ extending p such that $(q, G_1, L_2) \in \mathbf{F}$ for L_2 ; moreover, in fact, $L_2 = L$ is O.K.

[Why? Use the same $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$.]

Ax(XI.2): irrelevant and really follows by the moreover in (XI.1). □_{1.30}

Definition 1.32. A sequence $\mathbf{I} = \langle \bar{a}_s : s \in I \rangle$ in $G \in \mathbf{K}$ is κ -convergent when $\bar{a}_s \in {}^m G$ (for some fix m) and for every finite $K \subseteq G$ so some $q \in \mathbf{S}^m(K)$ for all but $< \kappa$ members s of I , $q = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_s, K, G)$; old: the $\bar{a}$'s are pairwise disjoint triples from G and for every finite $K \subseteq G$ for all but $< \kappa$ of the $s \in I$, we have $\bar{a}_s$ is $\bar{\varphi}$ -reasonable in (G, K) .

Remark 1.33. 1) So $\mathbf{F}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -constructions preserve “ $\mathbf{I}$ is κ -convergent”. Moreover, if $\mathbf{I}$ is κ -convergent in $G \in \mathbf{K}$ and $G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H$, where $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ then $\mathbf{I}$ is κ -convergent in H .

2) We can use I is a linear order with no last member and replace “all but $< \kappa$ of the $s \in I$ ” by “every large enough $s \in I$ ”.

Discussion 1.34. 1) In earlier tries, the notion of “ κ -convergent” $\langle \bar{a}_s : s \in I \rangle$, see [Sh:c], [Sh:300a] play a role in the proof in §5, still it seems worthwhile in the present context.

2) This holds for $\mathbf{F}_\kappa^{\text{df}}$ -construction, κ regular but this does not appear here.

* * *

We now turn to the third avenue of §(0B) to deal with the general and not necessarily symmetric case. Can we get uniqueness for non-symmetric $\mathfrak{S}$? Can we get every automorphism extendable, etc.? At some price, yes. A major point in the construction was the use of well ordered index set (λ in 1.30(1) or $\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ in general). But actually we can use non-well ordered index sets, so those index sets can have automorphisms which help us toward uniqueness. The solution here is not peculiar to locally finite groups.

Definition 1.35. We say (I, E) is λ -suitable when (we may omit λ when $\lambda = |I|$, we may write $(I, P_i)_{i < \lambda}$ with $\langle P_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ listing the E -equivalence classes (with no repetitions)):

- (a) I is a linear order
- (b) E is an equivalence relation on I with λ equivalence classes
- (c) every permutation of I/E is induced by some automorphism of the linear order which preserves equivalence and non-equivalence by E
- (d) each E -equivalence class has cardinality $|I|$.

Claim 1.36. Let $T = \text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, <, E)$ where $E := \{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a - b \in \mathbb{Q}\}$; so $(A, <, E) \models T$ iff $(A, <)$ is a dense linear order with neither first nor last element, E an equivalence relation with each equivalence class saturated.

1) If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and (I, E) is a saturated model of T of cardinality λ , then (I, E) is suitable⁶

2) For every λ the $(I, P_i)_{i < \lambda}$ from [Sh:E62, §2] (i.e. [Sh:e, Ch.AP, §2] and see history there) is λ -suitable.

3) There is a definable sequence $\langle (I_\lambda, P_i^\lambda)_{i < \lambda} : \lambda \text{ an infinite cardinal} \rangle$ such that $(I_\lambda, P_i^\lambda)_{i < \lambda}$ is λ -suitable and is increasing with λ .

Proof. 1) Obvious.

2),3) See there. □1.36

Claim 1.37. Assume

- (A) $G \in \mathbf{K}$ of cardinality λ
- (B) $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is closed and dense
- (C) $\mathcal{S} = \{t_i = (\mathfrak{s}_i, \bar{a}_i) : i < \lambda\}$ list $\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$, i.e. the pairs $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a})$, as in clause (d) of 1.30(1) or 1.30(3) but each appearing exactly once and let $t'_i = (\mathfrak{s}_*, < >)$ for $i \in [i(*), \lambda)$ (where $i(*) = \|\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)\|$), that is $\mathfrak{s}_* \in \mathfrak{S}, k_{\mathfrak{s}_*} = 0$ such $\mathfrak{s}_*$ exists, see e.g. 1.12
- (D) (I, E) is λ -suitable

⁶By similar arguments, if $\lambda = \lambda^\mu$ then there is a μ -suitable $(I, P_i)_{i < \mu}$ but $|I/E| = \mu < \lambda$. We can use any model of cardinality λ which is strongly μ^+ -sequence homogeneous; this means that every partial automorphism of cardinality $\leq \mu$ can be extended to an automorphism.

then we can find $H, \langle \bar{c}_r : r \in I \rangle$ (and we call H the ordered one step $\mathfrak{S}$ -closure of G , pedantically the ordered one step $(I, E) - \mathfrak{S}$ -closure of G) such that:

- (a) H is a xlf-group which $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -extends G
- (b) $\bar{c}_r \in {}^{n(t_i)}H$ if $r \in P_i$
- (c) H is generated by $G \cup \{\bar{c}_r : r \in I\}$
- (d) if $r \in P_i$ then $\bar{c}_r$ realizes in H over $\langle G \cup \{\bar{c}_s : s <_I r\} \rangle_H$ the type defined by $(\mathfrak{s}_i, \bar{a}_i)$
- (e) every automorphism of G can be extended to an automorphism of H .

Proof. Straightforward; e.g. to define H we should define $q_{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}} = \text{tp}(\bar{c}_{r_0} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{r_{n-1}}, G, H)$ for every $r_0 <_I \dots <_I r_{n-1}$ by induction on n , by clause (d) and prove that if $m \leq n$ and $h : \{0, \dots, m-1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ is increasing then $q_{r_{h(0)}, \dots, r_{h(m-1)}} \leq q_{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}}$ for the natural h_* .

Note that clause (e) follows by clauses (a)-(d) above recalling clause (c) of Definition 1.35.

Why? Let π be an automorphism of G , for each $i < \lambda$ we have $(\mathfrak{s}_i, \bar{a}_i) \in \mathcal{S}$ and also $(\mathfrak{s}_i, \pi(\bar{a}_i)) \in \mathcal{S}$, so by the choice of $\langle (\mathfrak{s}_i, \bar{a}_i) : i < \lambda \rangle$ there is a unique $j < \lambda$ such that $i \geq i(*) \Rightarrow j = i$ and $(\pi(\bar{a}_i), \mathfrak{s}_i) = (\bar{a}_j, \mathfrak{s}_j)$, so let $j = \hat{\pi}(i)$. So $\hat{\pi}$ is a permutation of λ . By “ $(I, P_i)_{i < \lambda}$ is λ -suitable” there is an automorphism $\tilde{\pi}$ of the linear order I such that $i < \lambda \Rightarrow \tilde{\pi}(P_i) = P_{\tilde{\pi}(i)}$. Clearly there is a unique automorphism $\hat{\pi}$ of H such that $\pi = \hat{\pi} \upharpoonright G$ and $\hat{\pi}(\bar{c}_i) = \bar{c}_{\tilde{\pi}(i)}$. $\square_{1.37}$

Remark 1.38. In what way is 1.37 weaker? We have to choose the listing of $\text{def}(G)$ in clause (C). Also for $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ it is not clear why $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ when (G_ℓ, H_ℓ) as above. But see 1.36(3).

Conclusion 1.39. *The parallel of parts (2)-(6) of 1.22 holds.*

Proof. Straight, for part (G) of 1.22 use 1.36(3). $\square_{1.39}$

§ 2. THERE ARE REASONABLE $\mathfrak{S}$

We like to have $\mathfrak{S}$ as in §1 for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ in particular dense so we have to look in details at amalgamations of lf-groups under special assumptions.

Recall the well known: for $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ finite groups we can amalgamate G_1, G_2 over G_0 , in fact, can be embedded into suitable finite permutations group and see proof and theorem of Hall, see §(0A).

Concerning the $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ versions of 2.2, see later in 6.6.

Convention 2.1. $\mathbf{K}$ is $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$.

Definition 2.2. 1) An amalgamation try $\mathbf{x}$ (or $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}}$) is a quintuple $(G_0, G_1, G_2, \mathbf{I}_1, \mathbf{I}_2) = (G_{\mathbf{x},0}, G_{\mathbf{x},1}, \dots)$ such that:

- (a) $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $\mathbf{I}_\ell$ is a set of representatives of the left G_0 -cosets in G_ℓ , i.e. $\langle gG_0 : g \in \mathbf{I}_\ell \rangle$ is a partition of G_ℓ (so without repetitions) for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) $e_{G_{\mathbf{x},0}} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1} \cap \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$.

2) For $\mathbf{x}$ as above let

- (a) $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{(g_0, g_1, g_2) : g_\ell \in G_\ell \text{ for } \ell = 0, 1, 2 \text{ and } g_1 \in \mathbf{I}_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{I}_2\}$
- (b) for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $g \in \mathbf{I}_\ell$ let $\mathcal{U}_g^\ell = \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x},g}^\ell := \{(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}} : g_\ell = g\}$
- (c) $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},1} \cup \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},2}$, see below
- (d) for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ let $\mathbf{j}_\ell = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ be the following embedding of G_ℓ into $\text{per}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}})$, the group of permutations of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$, so let $g \in G_\ell$ and we should define $\mathbf{j}_\ell(g)$, so let $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and we define $(g'_0, g'_1, g'_2) = (\mathbf{j}_\ell(g))(g_0, g_1, g_2)$ from $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as follows:

$\underline{\ell=0}$: $g'_0 = g_0 g$ in G_0 and $g'_1 = g_1, g'_2 = g_2$

$\underline{\ell=1}$: $g'_1 g'_0 = g_1 g_0 g$ in G_1 and $g'_2 = g_2$

$\underline{\ell=2}$: $g'_2 g'_0 = g_2 g_0 g$ in G_2 and $g'_1 = g_1$

3) Let $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the subgroup of $\text{per}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}})$ which $\text{Rang}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},1}) \cup \text{Rang}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},2})$ generates where $G_{\mathbf{x}} \models "f_1 f_2 = f_3"$ means that for every $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}, f_3(u) = f_2(f_1(u))$, i.e. we look at the permutation as acting from the right.

Observation 2.3. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be as in Definition 2.2, i.e. is an amalgamation try.

0) If $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}}$ we have $G_{\mathbf{x},\ell} = G_\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$.

1) In Definition 2.2(2), for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ if $g \in G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ then $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},\ell}(g)$ is a permutation of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

2) Moreover in part (1) the mapping $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ embeds the group $G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ into the group of permutation of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ hence into $G_{\mathbf{x}}$.

3) The mapping $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},0}$ is equal to $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},1}|_{G_{\mathbf{x},0}}$ and also to $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},2}|_{G_{\mathbf{x},0}}$.

4) If $G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ is finite for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ then $|G_{\mathbf{x}}| \leq (|G_{\mathbf{x},1}| \times |G_{\mathbf{x},2}| / |G_{\mathbf{x},0}|)!$

5) If $\mathbf{x}$ is an amalgamation try and $G_{\mathbf{x},0} \subseteq G'_\ell \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then for one and only one amalgamation try $\mathbf{y}$ we have $G_{\mathbf{y},0} = G_{\mathbf{x},0}, G_{\mathbf{y},\ell} = G'_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{y},\ell} = \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},\ell} \cap G'_\ell$.

6) Moreover in part (5), if $\mathbf{z}$ is an amalgamation try for $(G_{\mathbf{z},0}, G_{\mathbf{z},1}, G_{\mathbf{z},2}) = (G_{\mathbf{x},0}, G'_1, G'_2)$ then for some $\mathbf{x}'$, the pair $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z})$ is as in (5) and $(G_{\mathbf{x}',0}, G_{\mathbf{x}',1}, G_{\mathbf{x}',2}) = (G_{\mathbf{x},0}, G_{\mathbf{x},1}, G_{\mathbf{x},2})$.

7) In part (5) there is a unique homomorphism f from $G'_x = \langle \mathbf{j}_{x,1}(G'_1) \cup \mathbf{j}_{x,2}(G'_2) \rangle_{G_x}$ onto G_y such that $\ell \in \{1, 2\} \wedge g \in G'_\ell \Rightarrow \mathbf{j}_{y,\ell}(g) = f(\mathbf{j}_{x,\ell}(y))$.

8) In part (5), if G'_1, G'_2 are finite then $\langle \mathbf{j}_{x,1}(G'_1) \cup \mathbf{j}_{x,2}(G'_2) \rangle_{G_x}$ has at most $(n_*)^{m_*}$ members where $n_* = (|G_{x,1} \times G_{x,2}|)/|G_{x,0}|$, $m_* = (n_*)^{|G_{x,1}|+|G_{x,2}|}$.

Proof. Straight. E.g.

2) E.g. For $\ell = 1$ and $f, h \in G_1$ and $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}$ let $(\mathbf{j}_1(f))(g_0, g_1, g_2) = (g'_0, g'_1, g'_2)$ and $(\mathbf{j}_1(h))(g'_0, g'_1, g'_2) = (g''_0, g''_1, g''_2)$. Then $g_2 = g'_2$ and $g'_2 = g''_2$ and $g_1 g_0 f = g'_1 g'_0$ and $g'_1 g'_0 h = g''_1 g''_0$, hence $g_2 = g'_2$ and $g'_1 g'_0 = g_1 g_0 (fh)$, so $\mathbf{j}_1(fh)(g_0, g_1, g_2) = (g''_0, g''_1, g''_2) = (\mathbf{j}_1(h))(\mathbf{j}_1(f))(g_0, g_1, g_2)$, i.e. $G_x \models \text{"}\mathbf{j}_1(fh) = \mathbf{j}_1(f)\mathbf{j}_1(h)\text{"}$.

4) See part (8).

8) We define $E = \{((g'_0, g'_1, g'_2), (g''_0, g''_1, g''_2)) \in \mathcal{U}_x \times \mathcal{U}_x : g'_1 G'_1 = g''_1 G'_1 \text{ and } g'_2 G'_2 = g''_2 G'_2\}$, this is an equivalence relation of $\mathcal{U}_x$, each equivalence class has exactly $|\mathbf{I}_{x,1} \cap G'_1| \times |\mathbf{I}_{x,2} \cap G'_2| \times |G_{x,0}| = (|G'_1| \times |G'_2|)/|G_{x,0}|$ which is n_* members, and each of the permutations from $\mathbf{j}_{x,1}(G'_1) \cup \mathbf{j}_{x,2}(G'_2)$ maps each E -equivalence class onto itself. Hence there are $\leq m_* = n_*!^{|G'_1|+|G'_2|}$ isomorphism types of structure of the form: $N = (|N|, F_f^N)_{f \in G'_1 \cup G'_2}$, where $|N|$, the universe is an E -equivalence class, and for each $f \in G'_1 \cup G'_2$ we have: F_f^N is a permutation of this equivalence class. So the subgroup $\langle \mathbf{j}_{1,x}(G'_1) \cup \mathbf{j}_{2,x}(G'_2) \rangle_{G_x}$ of G_x has at most $(n_*)^{m_*}$ members; of course, the argument gives better bounds. $\square_{2.3}$

Claim 2.4. In Definition 2.2, $\mathbf{j}_{x,1}(G_1) \cap \mathbf{j}_{x,2}(G_1) = \mathbf{j}_{x,\ell}(G_0)$.

Remark 2.5. Helpful for the various NF's including [Sh:F1120, 3.15=d56].

Proof. Assume that $a_\ell \in G_\ell$ and $b_\ell = \mathbf{j}(a_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. It suffices to show that: if $a_1 \notin G_0 \wedge b_1 \notin G_0$ then $b_1 \neq b_2$ (in G_x). We check to what b_ℓ maps the triple $(e, e, e) \in \mathcal{U}_x$: by the definition of $\mathbf{j}_{x,1}, \mathbf{j}_{x,2}$ we have $b_1((e, e, e)) = (g'_0, g_1, e) \in \mathcal{U}_x$ where $G_1 \models g_1 g'_0 = b_1$, $b_2(((e, e, e))) = (g''_0, e, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_x$ where $G_2 \models g_2 g''_0 = b_2$. So if $b_1 = b_2$ then $g_1 = e = g_2$ so $g'_0 = b_1, g''_0 = b_2$ also $g'_0 = g''_0 \in G_0$ so we are done. $\square_{2.4}$

Definition 2.6. 1) Let $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ means that $G_\ell \subseteq G_3 (\in \mathbf{K})$ for $\ell < 3$ and $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G_1, G_2, \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3})$, see below.

2) Let $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ mean that:

- (a) $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \subseteq G_3 \in \mathbf{K}$ are finite groups for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$
- (c) if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}}$ and $G_0 = G_{\mathbf{x},0}, G_1 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},1}, G_2 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},1}$ then there is a homomorphism $\mathbf{f}$ from G_3 into $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $\mathbf{f}|_{G_\ell} = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (d) if $a \in G_3 \setminus \{e_{G_3}\}$ then for some $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}$ as above we have $\mathbf{f}(a) \neq e_{G_3}$.

Remark 2.7. Note the choice " $G_\ell \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ " rather than $G_\ell = G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$.

Claim 2.8. 1) In clause (c) of Definition 2.6(2), the homomorphism $\mathbf{f}$ is unique.

2) In Definition 2.6, necessarily $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$.

3) If $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ are finite for $\ell = 1, 2$ then we can find $\bar{f}, \bar{H}$ such that

- (a) $\bar{f} = \langle f_0, f_1, f_2 \rangle$

⁷NF stands for non-forking

- (b) $\bar{H} = \langle H_\ell : \ell \leq 3 \rangle$
- (c) $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(H_0, H_1, H_2, H_3)$
- (d) f_ℓ is an isomorphism from G_ℓ onto H_ℓ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$
- (e) $f_0 \subseteq f_1$ and $f_0 \subseteq f_2$.

Proof. E.g.

3) The least obvious point to check is: Why H_3 is finite? As in the proof of 2.3(8), you can consider equivalence classes for many such $\mathbf{x}$'s and 2.3(5),(6),(7),(8). $\square_{2.8}$

Claim 2.9. Assume $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$.

- 1) Also $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G_2, G_1, G_3)$ holds.
- 2) If $G_0 \subseteq G'_\ell \subseteq G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $G'_1 \cup G'_2 \subseteq G'_3 \subseteq G_3$ then $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G'_1, G'_2, G'_3)$.
- 3) Uniqueness: if $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G'_0, G'_1, G'_2, G'_3), G'_3 = \langle G'_1 \cup G'_2 \rangle_{G'_3}$ and f_ℓ is an isomorphism from G'_ℓ onto G_ℓ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ such that $f_1 \upharpoonright G'_0 = f_0 = f_2 \upharpoonright G'_0$ then there is an embedding f_3 of G'_3 into G_3 extending $f_1 \cup f_2$ (unique, of course; it onto only if $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$).
- 4) If $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}(G_2)$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, G_1, G_3)$ does not split over G_0 .

Proof. Straight.

- 1) Use the symmetry in the definition (recall that in §2 we have $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ not $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olif}}$!)
- 2) Use the uniqueness in 2.8(1) and $\mathbf{K}_{<\aleph_0}^{\text{lf}}$ having amalgamation.
- 3) Easily, too.
- 4) Obvious by parts (2) and (3). $\square_{2.9}$

We may use

Definition 2.10. Let $\text{NF}_f(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ or “ G_1, G_2 are NF_f -stably amalgamated over G_0 inside G_3 ” means that:

- (a) $G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell \leq 3$
- (b) G_0 is finite
- (c) $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \subseteq G_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (d) if G'_1, G'_2 are finite groups and $G_0 \subseteq G'_\ell \subseteq G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $G'_3 = \langle G'_1 \cup G'_2 \rangle_{G_3}$ then $\text{NF}_{\text{fin}}(G_0, G'_1, G'_2, G'_3)$.

Claim 2.11. *Stable Amalgamation over Finite Claim 1)* If $G_0 \in \mathbf{K}$ is finite and $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and for transparency $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$ then for some G_3 we have $\text{NF}_f(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ and $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle$.

2) In part (1), G_3 is unique up to isomorphism over $G_1 \cup G_2$.

Proof. Straight by 2.8(1), 2.9(3), 2.9(1), i.e. existence, uniqueness and monotonicity for finite G_1, G_2 . $\square_{2.11}$

Now we go back to the problem left in §1.

Definition/Claim 2.12. Let $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ be the closure of $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{atdf}}$, see Definition 1.15 where $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{atdf}} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{K})$ is defined such that for any existentially closed $G \in \mathbf{K}$, $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\text{atdf}}}(G) = \{\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G, G_3) : \text{there are } G_\ell \text{ for } \ell \leq 3 \text{ such that } G_1 = G, G_0 \text{ finite, } \text{NF}_f(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3) \text{ and } \bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(G_2)\}$.

Claim 2.13. 1) $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ is well defined, see Definition 2.12, 2.9(3).

2) $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ is dense (see Definition 1.15(2)), is closed and is countable.

Proof. 1) Obvious, see 1.2.

2) $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ is dense: holds by 2.11 and 2.9 recalling Definition 2.10.

$\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ is closed: by its definition.

$\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ is countable: as $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{atdf}}$ is by 2.9(3). □_{2.13}

Discussion 2.14. Is $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}$ symmetric? Not clear, however, in the end of §1 we circumvented this and we shall in §3 circumvent this in another way.

Claim 2.15. 1) Assume $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ and $|G_\ell| \geq \aleph_0$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and G_0 finite.

Then we can find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}}$ such that $G_\ell = G_{\mathbf{x}, \ell}$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ and $(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 0}(G_0) \subseteq \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, \ell}(G_\ell) \leq_{\mathfrak{S}_{\text{df}}} G_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\text{NF}_f(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 0}(G_0), \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(G_1), \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 0, 2}(G_2), G_{\mathbf{x}})$.

2) Assume $\mathfrak{S}$ is dense and closed. If $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$ and G is finite then $G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H$.

Remark 2.16. If $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then we can find infinite $G'_1, G'_2 \in \mathbf{K}$ extending G_1, G_2 respectively as $\mathbf{K}$ is closed under (finite) product (for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ use lexicographic order).

Proof. 1) By the definitions it is easy. That is, for $\ell = 1, 2$ we can choose $\mathbf{I}_\ell$ as in 2.2(1)(b) satisfying:

- (*) if $G'_\ell \subseteq G_\ell$ is finite and extends G_0 and $\mathbf{I}' \subseteq G'_\ell$ is such that $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{I}'$ and $\langle gG_0 : g \in \mathbf{I}' \rangle$ is a partition of G'_ℓ then we can find $g^* \in G_\ell$ such that $\{g^*g : g \in \mathbf{I}'\} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_\ell$.

Now think.

2) Easy, too. □_{2.15}

* * *

We now give some examples of $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$

Definition 2.17. 1) Let $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{cg}}$ be the $\mathfrak{s}$ from 2.18(2) below.

2) Let $\mathfrak{s}_{g\ell}$ be the $\mathfrak{s}$ from 2.18(3) below.

Claim 2.18. 1) For every $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ there are G^+, a such that $G \subseteq G^+ \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}, G^+ = \langle G \cup \{a\} \rangle_{G^+}$; in G^+ the element a does not commute with any $b \in G \setminus \{e_G\}$; a has order 2 and $G, a^{-1}Ga$ commute in G^+ .

2) There is unique $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ such that $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 0, n_{\mathfrak{s}} = 1$ so $p_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is empty and in part (1) above $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(a, G, G^+)$ is $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(<>, G)$.

3) There is $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ with $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 1, n_{\mathfrak{s}} = 4, p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \{x_0 = x_0^{-1}\}$ such that: if $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $a \in G$ realizing $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(x_0)$ then there are $G^+, \bar{c}$ such that $G \subseteq G^+ = \langle G \cup \bar{c} \rangle_{G^+}$, $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G, G^+) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\langle a \rangle, G)$ and each c_ℓ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_{\text{cg}}}(<>, G)$ in G^+ for $\ell < n_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $a \in \langle \bar{c} \rangle_{G^+}$.

Remark 2.19. This was used in stage E of the proof of Theorem 5.1 in an earlier version.

Proof. We first make a less specific construction for any $G \in \mathbf{K}$.

For $n < \omega$ let $\mathcal{U}_n = G \times n = \{(g, i) : g \in G, i < n\}$. For finite $K \subseteq G$ let $E_K := \{((g_1, i_1), (g_2, i_2)) : g_1, g_2 \in G \text{ and } i_1, i_2 < n \text{ and } g_1K = g_2K\}$, this is an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{U}_n$ each equivalence class with $\leq n \times |K|$ elements. For $\bar{a} \in {}^\omega G$ let $E_{\bar{a}} = E_K$ when $K = \langle \text{Rang}(\bar{a}) \rangle_G$ which is finite.

For $\bar{a} \in {}^nG$ and π a permutation of $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ let $h_{\bar{a}, \pi}$ be the following function from $\mathcal{U}_n$ into $\mathcal{U}_n$:

$$(*)_1 \quad h_{\bar{a}, \pi}((g, \iota)) = (ga_\iota, \pi(\iota)).$$

Clearly

$$(*)_2 \quad h_{\bar{a}, \pi} \text{ is a permutation of } \mathcal{U}_n \text{ which maps every } E_{\bar{a}}\text{-equivalence class onto itself.}$$

Let H be the group of permutations of $\mathcal{U}_n$ generated by $\{h_{\bar{a}, \pi} : \bar{a} \in {}^nG \text{ and } \pi \text{ is a permutation of } \{0, \dots, n-1\}\}$, now by $(*)_2$ it is easy to see that $H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ where, as in earlier cases,

$$\bullet \quad H \models "h = h_1 h_2" \text{ iff } x \in \mathcal{U}_n \Rightarrow h(x) = h_2(h_1(x)).$$

Now for $\iota < n$ let $\mathbf{j}_\iota$ be the following function from G into H :

$$(*)_3 \quad \mathbf{j}_\iota(a) = h_{\bar{b}, \pi} \text{ when } \pi = \text{the identity and } b_k \text{ is } a \text{ if } k = \iota \text{ and is } e_G \text{ otherwise.}$$

Now

$$(*)_4 \quad \text{for } \iota < n, \mathbf{j}_\iota \text{ is an embedding of } G \text{ into } H.$$

[Why? Check.]

We let $G^+, \mathbf{j}_*$ be such that $G^+ \supseteq G$ and $\mathbf{j}_*$ is an isomorphism from G^* onto H extending $\mathbf{j}_0$. For later use note

$$\boxplus \quad G \leq_{\Omega[\mathbf{K}]} G^+ \text{ equivalently } \mathbf{j}_*(G) \leq_{\Omega[\mathbf{K}]} H.$$

Now we prove each part.

1) Let $n = 2$ and π be the permutation of $\{0, 1\}$ such that $\pi(0) = 1, \pi(1) = 0$, and let $a = \mathbf{j}_*^{-1}(h_{\langle e_G, e_G \rangle, \pi})$.

2) Should be clear.

3) Note that

$$\oplus_1 \quad \mathbf{j}_*^{-1}(h_{\bar{a}, \pi}) \text{ realizes } q_{\text{seg}}(\langle \rangle, G) \text{ in } G^* \text{ when for some } k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \text{ we have}$$

- ₁ π is a permutation of $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and has order two
- ₂ $\pi(0) = k$
- ₃ $\pi(k) = 0$
- ₄ $\bar{a} \in {}^3G$ satisfies $a_{\pi(i)} = a_i^{-1}$ for $i < n$.

[Why? By $(*)_2$ and the choice of H clearly $h_{\bar{a}, \pi} \in H$ and inspecting $(*)_1$, easily $h_{\bar{a}, \pi}$ has order two. By the choice of $\mathbf{j}_*$, π as $\pi(0) = k, \pi(k) = 0$ and $a_k = a_0^{-1}$, for $g \in G$ we get $H \models "h_{\bar{a}, \pi}^{-1} \mathbf{j}_0(g) h_{\bar{a}, \pi} = \mathbf{j}_k(g)"$. However, for every $g_1, g_2 \in G$ the elements $\mathbf{j}_0(g_1), \mathbf{j}_k(g_2)$ of H commute as $h_{\bar{a}_1, \pi_1}, h_{\bar{a}_0, \pi_2}$ commute in H , e.g when $\pi_1 = \text{id}_n = \pi_2$ and $\bigwedge_{\ell < n} (a_{1, \ell} = e \vee a_{2, \ell} = e)$. Together we are done.]

Let $n = 3$ and for $\ell < 4$ let $g_\ell \in H$ be $h_{\bar{a}_\ell, \pi_\ell}$ where $\pi_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell$ are defined by:

$$\oplus_2 \quad \text{for } \ell < 4 \text{ let } \pi_\ell \text{ be such that}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \ell = 0, 3: \text{ the orbits are } \{0, 1\}, \{2\} \\ \ell = 1, 2: \text{ the orbits are } \{0, 2\}, \{1\} \end{array}$$

$$\oplus_3 \quad \text{let } \bar{a}_\ell = \langle a_{\ell, i} : i < 3 \rangle \text{ be } \langle a, a, e \rangle, \langle a, e, a \rangle, \langle e, e, e \rangle, \langle e, e, a \rangle \text{ for } \ell = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Now

$\oplus_4 \ c_\ell := \mathbf{j}_*^{-1}(h_{\bar{a}_\ell, \pi_\ell})$ realizes $q_{s_{cg}}(\langle \rangle, G)$ for $\ell < 4$.

[Why? We apply $\oplus_1$ with k being 1 for $\ell = 0, 3$ and 2 for $\ell = 1, 2$. So we have to check $\bullet_1 - \bullet_4$ for each ℓ ; now $\bullet_1 + \bullet_2 + \bullet_3$ holds by inspecting $\oplus_2$ and the choice of k . Lastly, for $\bullet_4$ note that a, e has order 2 and $a_{\ell,0} = a_{\ell,k}$ by inspecting $\oplus_3$.]

$\oplus_5 \ \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\langle c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 \rangle, G, G^*)$ does not split over $\langle a \rangle$, moreover is $q_t(\langle a \rangle, G)$ for some $t \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$.

[Why? Just think.]

Lastly,

$\oplus_6 \ G^+ \models "c_0 c_1 c_2 c_3 = a"$.

[Why? This is equivalent to $H \models h_{\bar{a}_0, \pi_0} h_{\bar{a}_1, \pi_1} h_{\bar{a}_2, \pi_2} h_{\bar{a}_3, \pi_3} = \mathbf{j}_0(a)$. By the definition of the product we check how each $(g, \ell) \in \mathcal{U}_n$ is mapped by each side (see above, so $h_{\bar{a}_0, \pi_0}$ is first) applying $h_{\bar{a}_\ell, \pi_\ell}$ in turn:

$$(g, 0) \mapsto (ga, 1) \mapsto (gae, 1) \mapsto (gaee, 1) \mapsto (gaeee, 0) = (ga, 0) = \mathbf{j}_0(a)(g, 0)$$

and (remember: $a = a^{-1}$):

$$(g, 1) \mapsto (ga, 0) \mapsto (gaa, 2) \mapsto (gaee, 0) \mapsto (gaeee, 1) = (g, 1) = \mathbf{j}_0(a)(g, 1)$$

$$(g, 2) \mapsto (ge, 2) \mapsto (gea, 0) \mapsto (geae, 2) \mapsto (geaea, 2) = (g, 2) = \mathbf{j}_0(a)(g, 2).$$

So we are done.] □_{2.18}

The following will be used in proof of existence of complete existentially closed G .

Claim 2.20. 1) If (A) then (B) where:

- (A) (a) $G_n \subseteq G_{n+1} \in \mathbf{K}$ for $n < \omega$ and I a set
- (b) $a_n^t \in G_{n+1}$ and let $b_n^t = a_0^t \dots a_n^t$ in G_{n+1} for $n < \omega$
- (c) $2 \leq k < \omega$ and $\bar{a}_n = \langle a_n^t : t \in I \rangle, \bar{b}_n = \langle b_n^t : t \in I \rangle$
- (d)(α) $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_n, G_n, G_{n+1})$ is increasing with n and
 - (β) $\text{cl}(\bar{a}_n, G_{n+1}) \cap G_n = \{e_{G_n}\}$; if $I = \{t\}$ this means that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have:

$$G_{n+1} \models "(a_n^t)^i = e_{G_1}" \text{ iff } (a_n^t)^i \in G_n \text{ iff } i = k$$
- (e) a_n^t commutes with every $c \in G_n$
- (f) $G_\omega = \cup \{G_n : n < \omega\}$ hence $\in \mathbf{K}$
- (B) for some $b_\omega^t, G_{\omega+1}$ for $t \in I$ we have
 - (a) $G_\omega \subseteq G_{\omega+1} = \langle G_\omega \cup \{b_\omega^t : t \in I\} \rangle \in \mathbf{K}$
 - (b) $p_n = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_\omega, G_n, G_{\omega+1}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_n, G_n, G_{n+1})$ where $\bar{b}_\omega = \langle b_\omega^t : t \in I \rangle$.

2) If we have (A) except omitting (A)(d)(β), still we have

(B)' (a) as above

- (b) $\bar{b}_\omega \upharpoonright u$ realizes $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{b}_n!, G_n! \upharpoonright u, G_{n+1})$ in $G_{\omega+1}$ when $u \subseteq I$ is finite and n is large enough.

Proof. 1) Letting $p_n(\bar{x}) = \text{tp}(\bar{b}_n, G_n, G_{n+1})$, it is enough to prove:

$$(*)_1 \quad p_n \subseteq p_{n+1}.$$

For this it is enough to prove, letting $\bar{y} = \langle y_t : t \in I \rangle$

- (*)₂ if $\sigma(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ is a group-term and $\bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}(G_n)$ then $G_{n+1} \models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) = e\text{"}$
iff $G_{n+2} \models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) = e\text{"}$.

Towards proving (*)₂ note

- $\bar{c}$ and $\bar{b}_n$, and hence $\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c})$ are from G_{n+1}
- a_{n+1}^t commutes with every $c_i (i < \ell g(\bar{c}))$ and with b_n^s for $s \in I$.

By clause (A)(b) of the assumption of the claim

$$\bullet \quad b_{n+1}^t = b_n^t a_{n+1}^t \quad \text{and} \quad b_n^t = b_{n-1}^t a_n^t.$$

Similarly

$$\bullet \quad a_n^t \text{ commute with every } c_i (i < \ell g(\bar{c})) \text{ and with } b_{n-1}^s \text{ for } s \in I$$

hence for some group term $\sigma_*(\bar{x})$

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \quad G_{n+2} &\models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \cdot \sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1})\text{"} \\ \bullet \quad G_{n+1} &\models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_{n-1}, \bar{c}) \cdot \sigma_*(\bar{a}_n)\text{"}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by clause (A)(d)(α), (β)

- $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) \in G_n$ iff $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) = e_{G_n}$ iff $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1}) \in e_{G_n}$ iff $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1}) \in G_{n+1}$
- if $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) \notin G_n$ hence $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1}) \notin G_{n+1}$ then both statements in (*)₂ fail because
 - (α) $\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c})$ is from G_{n+1} and $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1}) \notin G_{n+1}$ so $\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) \notin G_{n+1}$ hence $\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) \neq e_{G_n}$
 - (β) similarly $\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \notin G_n$ hence $\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \neq e_{G_n}$
- if $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) \in G_n$ hence $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) = e = \sigma_*(\bar{a}_{n+1})$ then $\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c})$ and again we are done.

2) Similarly without loss of generality I is finite; letting $p_n(\bar{y}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_n, G_n)$, we need

- (*)₁ if $\bar{c}$ is a finite sequence from G_ω then the sequence $\langle \text{tp}(\bar{b}_n! \hat{\bar{c}}, \emptyset, G_{n+1}) : n < \omega \rangle$ is eventually constant.

Let $K_n = \text{cl}(\bar{a}_n, G_{n+1})$, so by clause (A)(d)(α) of the assumption $|K_n|$ is constant, finite and $K_n \cap G_n$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing with n , hence for some $K_*, n(*)$ we have $n \geq n(*) \Rightarrow K_n \cap G_n = K_*$ and let $k(*) = |K_*|$, without loss of generality $n(*) \geq k(*)$; so it is enough to prove

- (*)₂ if $\bar{y} = \langle y_t : t \in I \rangle$ and $\sigma(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ is a group term, $\bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z})}(G_n)$ and $n \geq n(*)$ then $G_{n+1} \models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) = e\text{"}$ iff $G_{n+k(*)+1} \models \text{"}\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+k(*)}, \bar{c}) = e\text{"}$.

As in part (1) we can prove that for some group term $\sigma'(\bar{y})$ we have

▮ if $n \geq n(*)$ then $G_{n+2} \models \sigma(\bar{b}_{n+1}, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \cdot \sigma'(\bar{a}_{n+1})$.

Case 1: " $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) \notin G_n$ for some, equivalently every $n \geq n(*)$."

In this case $G_{n+1} \models \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \neq e$ for every $n \geq n(*)$.

Case 2: " $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n) \in G_n$ for some, equivalently every $n \geq n(*)$."

In this case there is b such that $\sigma_*(\bar{a}_n, \bar{c}) = b$ for every $n \geq n(*)$. So for every $n \geq n(*)$ by induction on m we can prove $\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+m}, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \cdot b^m$. But necessarily $b \in K_*$ has b has order dividing $|K_*| = k(*)$, hence $\sigma(\bar{b}_{n+k(*)}, \bar{c}) = \sigma(\bar{b}_n, \bar{c})$ and we can finish easily. $\square_{2.20}$

Definition/Claim 2.21. 1) For $k = 2, 3, \dots$ let $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}(k)}$ be the unique $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ such that

- (a) $n(\mathfrak{s}) = 1, k(\mathfrak{s}) = 0$
- (b) if $G \subseteq H$ and $c \in H$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(<, >, G) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(c, G, H)$ then c commutes with every $a \in G$
- (c) moreover for every $m < \omega, a^m = e_H$ iff $a^m \in G$ iff $k|m$.

2) Assume $K \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ is finite and $\bar{c} \in {}^{|K|}K$ list it. Then let $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}(\bar{c}, K)}$ be the unique $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ such that

- (a) $n(\mathfrak{s}) = \ell g(\bar{c}), k(\mathfrak{s}) = 0$ so $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \emptyset$
- (b) if $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $\bar{c}' \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s})}H$ then the following are equivalent
 - (α) $\bar{c}'$ realizes $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, \emptyset, K)$ and $\bar{c}'$ commutes with G and $\langle \bar{c}' \rangle_H \cap G = \{e\}$
 - (β) $\text{tp}(\bar{c}', G, H) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(<, >, G)$.

Claim 2.22. Assume $\text{NF}_f(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ and $a \in G_1 \setminus G_0, b \in G_2 \setminus G_0$. Then a, b commute in G_3 iff $a \in \text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0), b \in \text{Cm}_{G_2}(G_0)$ and G_0 is commutative.

Remark 2.23. 1) NF_f is from Definition 2.10.

2) Recall $g^{[a]} = a^{-1}ga$.

Proof. First assume

$$\oplus a \in \text{nor}_{G_1}(G_0) \text{ and } b \in \text{nor}_{G_2}(G_0).$$

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}}$ be such that $G_{\mathbf{x}, \ell} = G_{\ell}$ for $\ell < 3$ and let $f_a = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(a), f_b = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}(b)$.

Let $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and we should see whether $f_b \circ f_a((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = f_a \circ f_b((g_0, g_1, g_2))$; there are unique a', h_a, b', h_b such that

- (*)₀ (a) $g_1 a = a' h_a$ with $h_a \in G_0, a' \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}$
- (b) $g_2 b = b' h_b$ with $h_b \in G_0, b' \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}$.

Now

$$(*)_1 f_a((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (h_a g_0^{[a]}, a', g_2).$$

[Why? As $g_1 g_0 a = g_1 a g_0^{[a]} = a' (h_a g_0^{[a]})$ noting that $g_0^{[a]} \in G_0$ because we are assuming that a normalize G_0 inside G_1 .]

$$(*)_2 f_b((h_a g_0^{[a]}, a', g_2)) = (h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]}, a', b').$$

[Why? As $g_2 (h_a g_0^{[a]}) b = g_2 b (h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]}) = b' (h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]})$.] So

$$(*)_3 (f_b \circ b_a)((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]}, a', b').$$

Now

$$(*)_4 f_b((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (h_b g_0^{[b]}, g_1, b').$$

[Why? As $g_2 g_0 b = g_2 b g_0^{[b]} = b' h_b g_0^{[b]}$.]

$$(*)_5 f_a((h_b g_0^{[b]}, g_2, b')) = (h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}, a', b').$$

[Why? As $g_1(h_b g_0^{[b]})a = g_1 a(h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}) = a'(h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]})$.] Hence

$$(*)_6 (f_a \circ f_b)((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}, a', b').$$

Together we can deduce

$$(*)_7 (f_b \circ f_a)(g_0, g_1, g_2) = (f_a \circ f_b)(g_0, g_1, g_2) \text{ iff } h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]} = h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}.$$

Now, not assuming $\oplus$ we shall prove the claim by cases (using $(*)_7$ when $\oplus$ holds)

$\oplus_1$ a, b commute in G_3 when

- a commutes with G_0 in G_1
- b commutes with G_0 in G_2
- G_0 is commutative.

[Why? Note that the assumption $\oplus$ holds, and so let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_K$ be as above. For any $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we can apply $(*)_7$; now as $h_b, h_a, g_0 \in G_0$ and $a \in \text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0), b \in \text{Cm}_{G_2}(G_0)$ by the present assumptions clearly $h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]} = h_b h_a g_0 = h_a h_b g_0 = h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}$. So $f_a, f_b \in G_{\mathbf{x}}$ commute. As this holds for every appropriate $\mathbf{x}$ and $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ we are done.]

$\oplus_2$ a, b does not commute in G_3 when

- a commutes with G_0
- b commutes with G_0
- G_0 is not commutative.

[Why? Again $\oplus$ holds hence $(*)_7$ holds for any relevant $\mathbf{x}, g_0, g_1, g_2$. Choose $h_1, h_2 \in G_0$ which does not commute.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{K_{\text{if}}}$ be such that $G_{\mathbf{x}, \ell} = G_{\ell}$ for $\ell < 3, ah_1^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}, bh_2^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}$ and consider $(g_0, g_1, g_2) := (e, e, e)$, so $g_1 a = ea = a = (ah_1^{-1})h_1$. So in $(*)_0(a)$, we get $a' = ah_1^{-1}$ and $h_a = h_1$; similarly in $(*)_0(b)$ we get $b' = bh_2^{-1}, h_b = h_2$. So $f_a, f_b \in G_{\mathbf{x}}$ does not commute by $(*)_7$ because we get $h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]} = h_b h_a g_0 \neq h_a h_b g_0 = h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}$.]

$\oplus_3$ a, b does not commute in G_3 when

- a normalize G_0 in G_1
- b normalize G_0 in G_2
- b does not commute with G_0 in G_2 .

[Why? Again $\oplus$ holds hence we can apply $(*)_7$ for any relevant $\mathbf{x}, g_0, g_1, g_2$. Let $h_1 \in G_0$ not commute with b in G_2 and let $h_2 = e_{G_0}$. Choose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}}$ such that $ah_1^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ and $b = bh_2^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$ and let $(g_0, g_1, g_2) = (e, e, e)$; again in $(*)_0$ we get $a' = ah_1^{-1}, h_a = h_1$ and $b' = bh_2^{-1}, h_b = h_2$. Now $h_b h_a^{[b]} g_0^{[a][b]} = eh_a^{[b]} e = h_a^{[b]} \neq h_a = h_a e e = h_a h_b^{[a]} g_0^{[b][a]}$, the inequality by the choice of $h_a = h_1$.]

$\oplus_4$ a, b does not commute in G_3 when:

- a normalize G_0 in G_1
- b normalize G_0 in G_2
- a does not commute with G_0 in G_2 .

[Why? Like $\oplus_3$.]

Next

$\oplus_5$ a, b does not commute in G_3 if

- $a \in G_1 \setminus G_0$ does not normalize G_0 .

Choose $h \in G_0$ such that $a^{-1}ha \notin G_0$ hence $ha \notin aG_0$ and, of course, $ha \notin G_0$ as $a \notin G_0, h \in G_0$ and similarly $bh^{-1} \in G_2 \setminus G_0$.

Choose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}_{\text{if}}}$ such that $a \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}, bh^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$ and let $ha = a'g_0$ with $a' \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}, g_0 \in G_0$ so $a' \neq a$ by the choice of h .

Let f_a, f_b be chosen as above.

Now consider $(e, e, e) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ so

$$(*)'_1 f_a((e, e, e)) = (e, a, e).$$

[Why? As $a \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$.]

$$(*)'_2 f_b((e, a, e)) = (h, a, bh^{-1}).$$

[Why? Because $bh^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}, h \in G_0$.]

$$(*)'_3 (f_b \circ f_a)(e, e, e) = (h, a, bh^{-1}).$$

[Why? By $(*)_1' + (*)_2'$.]

$$(*)'_4 f_b((e, e, e)) = (h, e, bh^{-1}).$$

[Why? Because $bh^{-1} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$ and $h \in G_0$.]

$$(*)'_5 f_a((h, e, bh^{-1})) = (g_0, a', bh^{-1}).$$

[Why? As $a'g_0 = ha$.]

$$(*)'_6 (f_a \circ f_b)((e, e, e)) = (g_0, a', bh^{-1}).$$

[Why? By $(*)_4' + (*)_5'$.]

By $(*)_3' + (*)_6'$ as $a' \neq a$ the triple (e, e, e) exemplify $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},1}(a), \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},2}(b)$ does not commute in $G_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Lastly,

$\oplus_6$ a, b does not commute in G_3 when

- $b \in G_2 \setminus G_0$ does not normalize G_0 .

[Why? As in $\oplus_5$.]

As we have covered all the cases we are done. $\square_{2.22}$

Claim 2.24. *Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ and $G_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_2$, G_1 is ex.cl. and $d \in G_2$. If conjugations by d (in G_2) maps G_1 into itself then for some $c \in G_1$ we have $a \in G_1 \Rightarrow c^{-1}ac = d^{-1}ad$, i.e. $dc^{-1}a = adc^{-1}$, i.e. dc^{-1} commute with G_1 .*

Proof. Easy. Clearly there is $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) \in \text{def}(G_1)$ such that $\text{tp}(d, G_1, G_2) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_1)$ hence if $b, b_1, c_1 \in G_1$ and $\text{tp}(\langle b_1, c_1 \rangle, \bar{a}, G_1) = \text{tp}(\langle b, d^{-1}bd \rangle, \bar{a}, G_1)$ then $d^{-1}b_1d = c_1$. Having disjoint amalgamation we have $x \in G_1 \Rightarrow d^{-1}xd \in \text{cl}(\bar{a}^{\wedge} \langle x \rangle, G_1)$. We can continue or note that if there is no such $c \in G_1$, then every ex.cl G has a non-inner automorphism, contradiction. $\square_{2.24}$

§ 3. SYMMETRIZING

Our intention is to start with $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ which may contain $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ failing symmetry but have the nice conclusion as for symmetric $\mathfrak{S}$. Towards this we define the operation $\otimes$, related to $\oplus$ defined in Definition 1.15(4), (4A), and $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction (close but not the same as the constructions in Definition 1.21, 1.28, 1.31) and $\mathfrak{S} - \oplus$ -constructions.

Note that $\mathfrak{S}_{\text{atdf}}$ has “quasi symmetry”, i.e. when the parameter (= base of amalgamation) is the same, but when we allow increasing the base this is not clear. Now $\otimes$ is like $\oplus$ when we insist on its being symmetric. We use the construction here in §4, §5 where we sometimes give more details. Recall $\text{def}(G)$ for $G \in \mathbf{K}$ is from Definition 1.10.

Definition 3.1. For $t \in \text{def}(G)$ let $q_t(G) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_t}(\bar{a}_t, G)$ and $n_t = n_{\mathfrak{s}_t}, k_t = k_{\mathfrak{s}_t}$ and see 1.15(6).

Definition 3.2. 1) On $\text{def}(G)$ we define a (partial) operation $\otimes$ by $t_1 \otimes t_2 = (\mathfrak{s}_{t_1} \otimes \mathfrak{s}_{t_2}, \bar{b}_{t_1} \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_{t_2})$, see below.

2) $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{s}_2$ means that $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ are disjoint,⁸ $\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_1} \hat{\wedge} \bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}, \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_1} \hat{\wedge} \bar{z}_{\mathfrak{s}_2}$ so $k(\mathfrak{s}) = k(\mathfrak{s}_1) + k(\mathfrak{s}_2), n(\mathfrak{s}) = n(\mathfrak{s}_1) + n(\mathfrak{s}_2)$ and

- ▢ if $H \subseteq H^+ \in \mathbf{K}, \bar{a}_\ell \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s}_2)}H$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}_2})$ in H and $\bar{c}_\ell \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s}_\ell)}(H^+)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then $\bar{c}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{c}_2$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_2, H)$ iff:
 - (a) $\bar{a}_\ell$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}(\bar{b}_\ell, H)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
 - (b) if $\sigma(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \bar{y})$ is a group-term, $\ell g(\bar{z}_1) = n(\mathfrak{s}_1), \ell g(\bar{z}_2) = n(\mathfrak{s}_2)$ and $\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(H)$, then $(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\beta)$ where:
 - (α) $H^+ \models “\sigma(\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \bar{b}) = e_H”$
 - (β) $(\sigma(\bar{z}_1, \bar{c}_2, \bar{b}) = e) \in q_{\mathfrak{s}_1}(\bar{a}_1, H^+)$ and $(\sigma(\bar{c}_1, \bar{z}_2, \bar{b}) = e) \in q_{\mathfrak{s}_2}(\bar{a}_2, H^+)$.

Claim 3.3. 1) For $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}], \mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{s}_2$ belongs to $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$.

2) If $G \in \mathbf{K}$ and $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$ then $t = t_1 \otimes t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$.

Proof. Straightforward. □

Definition 3.4. 1) Let $\approx_G$ be the following two-place relation on $\text{def}(G) : (\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \approx_G (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2)$ if both are in $\text{def}(G)$ and $G \subseteq G^+ \in \mathbf{K} \Rightarrow q_{\mathfrak{s}_1}(\bar{a}_1, G^+) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_2}(\bar{a}_2, G^+)$.

2) For $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G)$ let $t_1 \leq t_2$ means $\bar{a}_{t_1} \leq \bar{a}_{t_2}$ and if $G \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2$ and $\bar{c}_2$ realizes $q_{t_2}(G_1)$ in G_2 then $\bar{c}_2 \upharpoonright n_{t_1}$ realizes $q_{t_1}(G)$ in G_2 .

3) $t_1 \leq_{\bar{h}} t_2$ is defined similarly.

Claim 3.5. 0) $\approx_G$ is an equivalence relation on $\text{def}(G)$.

1) If $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) \in \text{def}(G_1)$ and $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \in \mathbf{K}$ then $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_1) \subseteq q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_2)$ and $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) \in \text{def}(G_2)$.

2) If $G \in \mathbf{K}$ and $(\mathfrak{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \in \text{def}(G)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then the satisfaction of $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \approx_G (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2)$ depends just on $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_2, \emptyset, G)$.

3) Transitivity: in Definition 3.4(2), $\leq$ is indeed a partial order.

4) Moreover if $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \leq_{\bar{h}_1} (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2) \leq_{\bar{h}_2} (\mathfrak{s}_3, \bar{a}_3)$ then $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \leq_{\bar{h}_2 \circ \bar{h}_1} (\mathfrak{s}_3, \bar{a}_3)$.

Proof. Easy. □_{3.5}

⁸as we use only invariant $\mathfrak{S}$, this is not a real restriction

Claim 3.6. 0) The operation $\otimes$ on disjoint pairs respects congruency (see Definition 1.10(3), Claim 1.18(1)).

1) The operation $\otimes_G$ respect $\approx_G$, i.e. if $t_1 \approx_G t'_1$ and $t_2 \approx_G t'_2$ then $t_1 \oplus t_2 \approx_G t'_1 \oplus t'_2$ assuming the operations are well defined, of course.

2) If $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) = (\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \otimes_G (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2)$ then $(\bar{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \leq (\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a})$.

3) If in $\text{def}(G)$ we have $t_\ell \leq t'_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $t_1 \otimes t_2$ is well defined (i.e. t'_1, t'_2 are disjoint) then $t_1 \otimes t_2 \subseteq t'_1 \otimes t'_2$.

4) The operation $\otimes$ and is associative and is symmetric, i.e. $G \subseteq G^+$ and $(\mathfrak{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \in \text{def}(G)$ and $\bar{c}_\ell^\ell \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_{3-\ell}^\ell$ realizes $q_{t_\ell}(G)$ in G^+ where $t_\ell = (\mathfrak{t}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) = (\mathfrak{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \otimes (\mathfrak{s}_{3-\ell}, \bar{a}_{3-\ell})$ so assume disjointness for transparency, for $\ell = 1, 2$, then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_1^1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{c}_2^1, G, G^+) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_1^2 \hat{\wedge} \bar{c}_2^2, G, G^+)$.

5) If in $\text{def}(G)$ we have $(\mathfrak{s}_\ell, \bar{a}_\ell) \leq_{h_\ell} (\mathfrak{s}'_\ell, \bar{a}'_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\text{Dom}(h_1) \cap \text{Dom}(h_2) = \emptyset$, $\text{Rang}(h_1) \cap \text{Rang}(h_2) = \emptyset$ then $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \bar{a}_1) \otimes (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2) \leq_{h_1 \cup h_2} (\mathfrak{s}'_1, \bar{a}'_1) \otimes (\mathfrak{s}'_2, \bar{a}'_2)$.

Proof. Straight. □_{3.6}

Remark 3.7. Also the operation $\oplus$ satisfies the parallels of 3.6(1),(2),(3) and the first demand in (4).

Definition 3.8. Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is closed.

1) We say $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is $\otimes$ -closed when (recalling it is invariant and) if $\mathfrak{s}_\ell \in \mathfrak{S}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ are disjoint then $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{s}_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$.

2) The $\otimes$ -closure of $\mathfrak{S}$ is the $\subseteq$ -minimal $\otimes$ -closed $\mathfrak{S}' \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ such that $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}'$.

3) Let $G_3 = G_1 \overset{\mathfrak{S}}{\otimes}_{G_0} G_2$ or $G_3 = \otimes_{\mathfrak{S}}(G_0, G_1, G_2)$ mean $G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_2 \subseteq G_3, G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_1 \subseteq G_3, G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$ and if $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_\ell, G_0, G_\ell) = q_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}(\bar{a}_\ell, G_0)$ so $\bar{c}_\ell \in \omega^{>}(G_\ell), \bar{a}_\ell \in \omega^{>}(G_0)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{c}_2, G_0, G_3) = q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_2, G_0)$ when $(\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}_1 \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}_2) = (\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}_1) \otimes (\mathfrak{s}_2, \bar{a}_2)$.

4) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ means that $G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and the demands in (3) hold except possibly $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$.

Claim 3.9. Assume $\mathfrak{S}$ is closed and $\otimes$ -closed.

1) $G_3 = \otimes_{\mathfrak{S}}(G_0, G_1, G_2)$ iff $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ and $G_3 = \langle G_1 \cup G_2 \rangle_{G_3}$.

2) (disjointness): $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ implies $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$.

3) (uniqueness): If $G_3^\iota = \otimes_{\mathfrak{S}}(G_0^\iota, G_1^\iota, G_2^\iota)$ for $\iota = 1, 2$ and f_ℓ is an isomorphism from G_ℓ^1 onto G_ℓ^2 for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $f_1 \upharpoonright G_0^1 = f_2 \upharpoonright G_0^1$ and G_0 is existentially closed⁹ then there is one and only one isomorphism from G_3^1 onto G_3^2 extending $f_1 \cup f_2$ which is well defined by (2).

4) (symmetry): $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ iff $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_2, G_1, G_3)$.

5) (monotonicity): If $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$ and $G_0 \subseteq G'_\ell \subseteq G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G'_1, G'_2, G_3)$.

6) (existence): If $G_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and G_0 is existentially closed and $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$ then for some $G_3 \in \mathbf{K}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{S}}^2(G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3)$.

⁹Why? The problem is that $G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H \in \mathbf{K}$ does not imply the existence of $\bar{t} = \langle t_{\bar{c}} : \bar{c} \in \omega^{>}(H) \rangle$ such that $t_{\bar{c}} \in \text{def}(G), \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G, H) = q_{t_{\bar{c}}}(G)$ and if $\bar{c}^* = \langle c_{h(i)}^2 : i < \ell g(\bar{c}^1) \rangle$ then $t_{\bar{c}^1} \leq_h t_{\bar{c}^2}$. Moreover if there is such $\bar{t}$ we can “amalgamate for it” but this is not enough as $\bar{t}$, it is not necessarily unique, which may give different results. Why 3.9(3) is O.K.? As in Definition 3.11(3) we ask for every $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$. In other words if $G_0 \subseteq G_1, G_0 \subseteq G_2$ and $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G_0), \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G_0, G_2) = q_{t_\ell}(G_0)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ but $q_{t_1}(G_1) \neq q_{t_2}(G_1)$ we can amalgamate as in 3.8(3).

Remark 3.10. For parts (3) and (6) of 3.9 recall: for such G_2 , if $t_1, t_2 \in \text{def}(G_0)$, $q_{t_1}(G_0) = q_{t_2}(G)$ and $G \subseteq G^+ \in \mathbf{K}$ then $q_{t_1}(G^+) = q_{t_2}(G^+)$.

Proof. Straight, e.g. for disjointness (= part (2)) use Claim 1.11(4). $\square_{3.9}$

Alternative to §1 from 1.21 on is:

Definition 3.11. 1) We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is a one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction when $\mathcal{A} = (G, H, \langle \bar{c}_\alpha, t_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A}) \rangle)$ satisfies:

- (a) $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$
- (b) $t_\alpha \in \text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$ for $\alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A})$
- (c) if $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} < \alpha(\mathcal{A})$ with no repetitions then $\bar{c}_{\alpha_0} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{\alpha_{n-1}}$ realizes $t_{\alpha_0} \otimes \dots \otimes t_{\alpha_{n-1}}$ over G in H
- (d) $H = \langle \cup \{ \bar{c}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A}) \} \cup G \rangle_H$
- (e) $\langle t_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A}) \rangle$ list $\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$.

2) In (1) we may use any index set instead of $\alpha(\mathcal{A})$, e.g. $\text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$ itself.

3) We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\alpha(\mathcal{A})$ -step- $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction when

- (a) $\mathcal{A} = \langle G_\alpha, \langle \bar{c}_{\beta,s}, t_{\beta,s} : s \in S_\beta \rangle : \alpha \leq \alpha(\mathcal{A}), \beta < \alpha(\mathcal{A}) \rangle$
- (b) $\langle G_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha(\mathcal{A}) \rangle$ is increasing continuous (in $\mathbf{K}$)
- (c) $\langle G_\alpha, G_{\alpha+1}, \langle \bar{c}_{\alpha,s}, t_{\alpha,s} : s \in S_\alpha \rangle \rangle$ is a one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction.

4) So in part 3), $G_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}} = G_\alpha[\mathcal{A}]$ is G_α , etc., and in part (1), $G^{\mathcal{A}} = G[\mathcal{A}]$ is G , etc.

5) In part (3) for every $\alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A})$ the sequence $\langle G_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}, G_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{A}}, \langle \bar{c}_{\alpha,s}, t_{\alpha,s} : s \in S_\alpha \rangle \rangle$ is called the α -th step of $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 3.12. 1) We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a λ -full one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction when it is a one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction and for every $t \in \text{def}(G_0^{\mathcal{A}})$ for exactly λ ordinals $\alpha < \alpha(\mathcal{A})$ we have $(\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{a}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}) = t$.

1A) We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a λ -full α -step- $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction when it is an α -step- $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction and each step is λ -full.

2) We say H is a λ -full α -step $\mathfrak{S}$ -constructible over G when there is a λ -full α -step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction $\mathcal{A}$ with $G = G_0^{\mathcal{A}}, H = G_{\ell g(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}}$.

3) We say G_* is $(\lambda, \delta) - \mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -full over G when for some $\bar{G} = \langle G_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ increasing continuous sequence in $\mathbf{K}$, $G_0 = G$, $G_\delta = G_*$ and G_{i+1} is $(\lambda, 1) - \mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -full over G_i which means some $G' \subseteq G_{i+1}$ is λ -full one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -constructible over G_i . If $\delta = \omega$ one may omit it writing λ instead of (λ, δ) .

Claim 3.13. Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is $\otimes$ -closed.

1) If $G \in \mathbf{K}$ then there is a one step λ -full $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction $\mathcal{A}$ over G (i.e. $G_0^{\mathcal{A}} = G$) of cardinality $\lambda + |G| + |\mathfrak{S}|$.

2) If in part (1), $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are λ -full α -step- $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction over G then $G_\alpha[\mathcal{A}_1], G_\alpha[\mathcal{A}_2]$ are isomorphic over G .

3) For any λ, δ and $G \in \mathbf{K}$ there is $G_* \in \mathbf{K}$ which is a λ -full δ -step- $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -constructible over G and it is unique up to isomorphism over G .

4) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is dense, H is $(\lambda, \alpha) - \mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -full over G and α is a limit ordinal then $H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$.

Proof. Straight, as in 1.30(3). $\square_{3.13}$

Remark 3.14. We can also imitate 1.22(6).

* * *

In §4,§5 we intend to use also some relative of those constructions, including:

Definition 3.15. Assume $\bar{H} = \langle H_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing in $\mathbf{K}$ and $H_\delta = \cup\{H_i : i < \delta\}$, (we shall use $\delta = \omega$). We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a one step atomic $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -construction above $\bar{H}$ when (and may say H is weakly atomically $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -constructible over $\bar{H}$; omitting $\bar{H}$ means for some $\bar{H}$ of length ω , we may replace $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ by any index set) it has the following objects satisfying the following additional condition

- (A) $(\bar{H}, H_\delta, H, \langle \bar{c}_\alpha, t_{\alpha,i}, \alpha < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, i < \ell g(\bar{H}) \rangle)$
- (B) $H_\delta \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}$
- (C) $t_{\alpha,i} \in \text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(H_i)$
- (D) $H = \langle \cup\{\bar{c}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}\} \cup H_\delta \rangle_H$
- (E) $\bar{c}_\alpha$ realizes $q_{t_{\alpha,i}}(H_i)$ in H for $\alpha < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, i < \delta$
- (F) $\bar{c}_{\alpha,i} \subseteq H_{i+1}$ realizes $q_{t_{\alpha,i}}(H_i)$ for $i < \ell g(\bar{H}), \alpha < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ and moreover
- (F)⁺ assuming $\alpha(0) < \dots < \alpha(n-1) < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\ell g(\bar{x}_\alpha) = \ell g(\bar{c}_\alpha)$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}_{\alpha(0)}, \dots, x_{\alpha(n-1)}, \bar{y})$ we have $\varphi(\bar{x}_{\alpha(0)}, \dots, \bar{x}_{\alpha(n-1)}, \bar{b}) \in \text{tp}_{\text{at}}(\bar{c}_{\alpha(0)} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{\alpha(n-1)}, G_\delta, H)$ iff $\bar{b} \subseteq {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}G_\delta$ and for every permutation π of n , $(\forall^\infty i(0) < \delta)(\forall^\infty i(1) < \delta), \dots, (\forall^\infty i(n-1) < \delta) \varphi[\bar{c}_{\alpha(0),i(\pi(0))}, \bar{c}_{\alpha(1),i(\pi(1))}, \dots, \bar{c}_{\alpha(n-1),i(\pi(n-1))}, \bar{b}]$ for $i < \delta$ (used in the proof of (*)_{5.2} stage C in the proof of 5.1); note that φ is not necessarily atomic.

Remark 3.16. 1) We may consider replacing clause (F)⁺ by:

$$(F)^* \quad \bar{c}_{\alpha(0)} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{\alpha(n-1)} \text{ realizes } q_{t_{\alpha(0)} \otimes \dots \otimes t_{\alpha(n-1)}} \text{ for } \alpha(0) < \dots < \alpha(n-1) < \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

2) In this alternative version we do not need the existence of $\bar{c}_{\alpha,i} \subseteq H_{i+1}$, so easier to prove existence but the version above is the one we actually use. In particular the version in (1) would make problems in (*)_{5.7} in the proof of 5.1; we may try to take care of this by changing the definition of L_β^* there.

3) A sufficient condition for having the assumptions 3.15 appear in 2.20.

Observation 3.17. Let $\mathfrak{S}$ be closed and $\otimes$ -closed. Assume $\langle G_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous in $\mathbf{K}$ and G .

- 1) In 3.11(1) we can prove $G^{\mathcal{A}} \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H^{\mathcal{A}}$ and in 3.11(2), we can prove $\langle G_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}} : \alpha \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -increasing continuous.
- 2) In 3.15, if $\bar{H}$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -increasing then we have $i < \delta \Rightarrow H_i \subseteq_{\mathfrak{S}} H$.
- 3) Assume S is a set of limit ordinals $< \delta$, $\langle G_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is a $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous sequence of members of $\mathbf{K}$ and G_{i+1} is a one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -constructible over G_i for $i \in \delta \setminus S$ and G_{i+1} is a weakly one step $\mathfrak{S} - \otimes$ -constructible over $\bar{G}|C_i$ for some unbounded $C_i \subseteq i \setminus S$ for each $i \in S$, hence i is a limit ordinal. Then $i < j \leq \delta \wedge i \notin S \Rightarrow G_i \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_j$.

Remark 3.18. The idea of $\mathfrak{s}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{s}_2$ can be applied to one $\mathfrak{s}$ (and is used in the end of the proof of $\boxplus_1$ in stage B the proof of Theorem 5.1).

Toward this in §4(B) we shall deal with finding such amalgamations and $\mathfrak{s}$'s.

Definition/Claim 3.19. Assume $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ and $H_1 \subseteq H_2 \in \mathbf{K}$ are finite, $\bar{a} \in {}^{k(\mathfrak{s})}(H_1)$, $\bar{c} \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s})}(H_2)$ and $\bar{a}, \bar{c}$ generated H_1, H_2 respectively and $\bar{a}$ realizes $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}})$ in H_1 and $\bar{c}$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, H_1)$ in H_2 . Assume further K is a group of automorphisms of H_2 mapping H_1 onto itself. Then there is a one and only one $\mathfrak{t}$ such that:

- (a) $\mathfrak{t} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$
- (b) $k(\mathfrak{t}) = k(\mathfrak{s})$ and $p_{\mathfrak{t}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{t}}) = \text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{a}, \emptyset, H_1)$
- (c) if $H_1 \subseteq G_1 \subseteq G_2, H_2 \subseteq G_2$ and $\bar{c}$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G_1)$ in G_2 and $\bar{c}' \in {}^n(G_2)$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{t}}(\bar{a}, G_2)$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{at}}(\bar{c}', G_1, G_2) = \cap \{\text{tp}_{\text{at}}(\pi(\bar{c}), G_1, G_2) : \pi \in K\}$.

Remark 3.20. Toward this in §(4B) we deal with finding such amalgamations and $\mathfrak{s}$'s.

Proof. Straight. □

§ 4. FOR FIXING A DISTINGUISHED SUBGROUP

In the construction of complete members of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ (and related aims) we fix large enough $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}]$ and build a $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous sequence $\langle G_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, $|G_\alpha| < \lambda$; normally we demand for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ “usually” $G_\alpha \subseteq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_\beta$ (i.e. except for $\delta \in S$, where $S \subseteq S_{\aleph_0}^\lambda$). But at some moment we like for $\alpha = \delta + n$, use $p = \text{tp}(c, G_\alpha, G_{\alpha+1})$ which extends some $r \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}(K)$, $K \subseteq G_\alpha$ finite but such that c commutes with G_δ . Toward this in §(4A) we deal with a relative NF^3 of NF_f , in which we demand $\text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_3)$ is large, this continues §2 concentrating on the case G_0 is with trivial center. In §(4B) we use this to define some schemes from $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$, e.g. see 4.8.

Another problem is that given G_1 instead of extending G_1 to G_2 such that $q_t(G_1)$ is realized by $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(G_2)$ for some $t \in \text{def}_s(G_1)$, we like to have an infinite $\bar{c} = (\dots \hat{c}_i \dots)_{i \in I}$, with $\text{tp}(\bar{c}|u, G_1, G_2) \in q_{t_u}(G_1)$ for every finite $u \subseteq I$; used in stage D of the proof of Theorem 5.1. This is done in §4(C).

§ 4(A). Preserving Commutation.

Claim 4.1. *The subgroups H'_1, H'_2 of G_3 commute when:*

- (*) (a) $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}}$
- (b) $G_\ell = G_{\mathbf{x}, \ell}, G'_\ell = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, \ell}(G_\ell)$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$,
- (c) $G_3 = G_{\mathbf{x}}$
- (d) $H_1 \subseteq G_1, H_0 = H_1 \cap G_0$ and $H'_1 = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(H_\ell)$
- (e) $H_1 = \cup \{bH_0 : b \in \mathbf{I}_1\}$ where $\mathbf{I}_1 = \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1} \cap H_1$
- (f) if $g \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}$ and $b \in \mathbf{I}_1$ then $gb \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}$
- (g) the subgroups G_0, H_1 of G_1 commute
- (h) $H_2 \subseteq G_2$ commute with H_0 in H_2 and $H'_2 = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}(H_2)$
- (i) $H_2 = \cup \{bH_0 : b \in \mathbf{I}_2\}$ where $\mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 2} \cap H_2$
- (j) $H'_0 = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, \ell}(G_0)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

Remark 4.2. 1) Really here it suffices to deal with the case $H_0 = \{e\}$.

2) A natural case is $\text{Cent}(G_0) = \{e_{G_0}\}, H_1 = \text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0), H_2 = G_2$.

3) See the proof of 5.1.

Proof. Let $a \in H_2, b \in H_1, f_a = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}(a), f_b = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(b)$, so by $(*) (d), (h)$ we just have to prove that $f_b f_a((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = f_a f_b((g_0, g_1, g_2))$ for any $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Clearly

- if $a \in G_0$ or $b \in G_0$ this holds.

[Why? First, if $a \in G_0$ then $f_a = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}(a) = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 0}(a) = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(a) \in G_{\mathbf{x}}$ and as $b \in H_1 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x}}$, by $(*) (g)$ we have $G_1 \models “a, b \text{ commute}”$ hence $G_{\mathbf{x}} \models “\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 2}(a), \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(b) \text{ commute}”$ so $G_{\mathbf{x}} \models “f_a, f_b \text{ commute}”$. Second, if $b \in G_0$ then $b \in G_0 \cap H_1 = H_0$ but $H_0 \subseteq G_2$ and $a \in H_2 \subseteq G_2$ so by clause $(*) (h)$ clearly $G_2 \models “a, b \text{ commute}”$ and we finish as above.]

Moreover, as $H_1 = \langle H_0 \cup \mathbf{I}_1 \rangle_{G_1}$ by clause $(*) (e)$, without loss of generality

$$\boxplus_1 b \in \mathbf{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x}, 1}.$$

By clause $(*) (i)$, without loss of generality

$$\boxplus_2 \ a \in \mathbf{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}.$$

Let $f_x((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (g_0^x, g_1^x, g_2^x)$ and $f_y f_x((g_0, g_1, g_2)) = (g_0^{x,y}, g_1^{x,y}, g_2^{x,y})$ for $x \in \{a, b\}$ and $y \in \{a, b\} \setminus \{x\}$.

We shall prove that $g_\ell^{a,b} = g_\ell^{b,a}$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$; this suffices.

Hence

- ₁ $g_1^a = g_1$ and $g_2 g_0 a = g_2^a g_0^a$
- ₂ $g_2^{a,b} = g_2^a$ and $g_1 g_0^a b = g_1^{a,b} g_0^{a,b}$
- ₃ $g_2^b = g_2$ and $g_1 g_0 b = g_1^b g_0^b$
- ₄ $g_1^{b,a} = g_1^b$ and $g_2^b g_0^b a = g_2^{b,a} g_0^{b,a}$.

Now

$$\boxplus_3 \ g_1^{a,b} G_0 = g_1^{a,b} g_0^{a,b} G_0 = g_1^a g_0^a b G_0 = (g_1^a b)(g_0^a G_0) = (g_1^a b) G_0.$$

[Why? As $g_0^{a,b} \in G_0$, by the second statement of •₂, noting that b, g_0^a commute by $(*)(g)$, and as $g_0^a \in G_0$ respectively.]

But $g_1^a \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ (as $(g_0^a, g_1^a, g_2^a) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$), and $b \in \mathbf{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ hence by $(*)(f)$ we have $g_1^a b \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ and also $g_1^{ab} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ (as $(g_0^{a,b}, g_1^{a,b}, g_2^{a,b}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$). So by $\boxplus_3$ and the last two sentences $g_1^{a,b} G_0 = (g_1^a b) G_0$ and $g_1^{a,b}, g_1^a \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ hence

$$\bullet_5 \ g_1^{a,b} = g_1^a b.$$

So by the second equation in •₂ recalling b, g_0^a commute by $(*)(g)$ we have

$$\bullet_6 \ g_0^{a,b} = g_0^a.$$

Similarly we have

$$\boxplus_4 \ g_1^b G_0 = g_1^b g_0^b G_0 = g_1 g_0 b G_0 = (g_1 b)(g_0 G_0) = (g_1 b) G_0.$$

[Why? As $g_0^b \in G_0$, by •₃ second statement, as b, g_0 commute by $(*)(g)$, as $g_0 \in G$ respectively.]

Also $g_1 \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}$ as $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b \in \mathbf{I}_1$ by $\boxplus_1$ so recalling $(*)(f)$ we deduce $g_1, g_1 b \in \mathbf{I}_1$ hence

$$\bullet_7 \ g_1^b = g_1 b$$

hence by •₃ second statement recalling b, g_0 commute (by $(*)(g)$) we have

$$\bullet_8 \ g_0^b = g_0.$$

So by •₄, •₇, •₁, •₆, b commuting with G_0 and •₂ respectively, we have

$$\boxplus_5 \ g_1^{b,a} = g_1^b = (g_1 b) = (g_1^a b) = (g_1^a b)(g_0^a (g_0^{a,b})^{-1}) = (g_1^a g_0^a b)(g_0^{a,b})^{-1} = g_1^{a,b}$$

hence

$$\bullet_9 \ g_1^{b,a} = g_1^{a,b}.$$

Also by •₄, •₃, •₈, •₁, •₆, •₂ we have

$$\boxplus_6 \ g_2^{b,a} g_0^{b,a} = g_2^b g_0^b a = g_2 g_0^b a = g_2 g_0 a = g_2^a g_0^a = g_2^a g_0^{a,b} = g_2^{a,b} g_0^{a,b}.$$

So

$$\bullet_{10} \ g_2^{b,a} g_0^{b,a} = g_2^{a,b} g_0^{a,b}$$

but $g_0^{b,a}, g_0^{a,b} \in G_0$ and $g_2^{b,a}, g_2^{a,b} \in \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$ hence

$$\bullet_{11} \quad g_2^{b,a} = g_2^{a,b} \text{ and } g_0^{b,a} = g_0^{a,b}.$$

But $\bullet_{11} + \bullet_9$ imply that we are done. $\square_{4.1}$

The following claim is like Definition 2.6, but now we keep a large $\text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0)$ using 4.1.

Definition 4.3. Let $\text{NF}^3(\bar{G}, H_1, L)$ mean, (if $H_1 = L$ we may omit H_1 , also we may replace H_1 by $H_0 := G_0 \cap H_1$ see (A)(d) below; lastly if $\text{Cent}(G_0) = \{e_{G_0}\}$, $L = \text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0)$ and $H_1 = \{gx : g \in G_1, x \in L\}$ then we may omit both L and H_1)

- (A) (a) $\bar{G} = \langle G_\ell : \ell \leq 3 \rangle$ are from $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$
- (b) $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) G_0 is finite
- (d) $H_1 \subseteq \text{Cm}_{G_1}(G_0)$, $L \subseteq H_1$, $L \cap G_0 = \{e_{G_0}\}$, $H_1 = \langle L, G_0 \cap H_1 \rangle_{G_1}$
- (e) $G_1 \cap G_2 = G_0$
- (B) (a) $G_\ell \subseteq G_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) for $\sigma(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ a group-term, $\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}(G_1)$ and $\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(G_2)$ the following conditions are equivalent
 - $G_3 \models \sigma(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = e_{G_3}$
 - if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{lf}}$, $G_\ell = G_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ and H_1 (as above) $H_2 := \text{Cm}_{G_2}(H_1 \cap G_0)$ satisfies the assumptions of the claim 4.1 and $\bar{a}' = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},1}(\bar{a})$ and $\bar{b}' = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},2}(\bar{b})$ then $G_{\mathbf{x}} \models \sigma(\bar{a}', \bar{b}') = e_{G_{\mathbf{x}}}$.

Claim 4.4. Assume $\bar{G} = \langle G_\ell : \ell < 3 \rangle$, $G_0 \subseteq G_\ell \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, $L \subseteq G_1$, $L \cap G_0 = \{e_{G_0}\}$, G_0 is finite, $H_0 \subseteq G_0$, $H_1 = \langle H_0 \cup L \rangle_{G_1}$, $H_1^+ = \langle G_0 \cup L \rangle_{G_1}$ and we let $H_2 = \text{Cm}_{G_2}(H_0)$.

- 1) We can find $\mathbf{x}$ as required in (*) of 4.1.
- 2) There is $G_3 \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ such that $\text{NF}^3(\langle G_0, G_1, G_2, G_3 \rangle, H_1, L)$ and G_3 is unique up to isomorphism over $G_1 \cup G_2$.

Proof. 1) We have to choose $\mathbf{I}_1^*, \mathbf{I}_2^*$ satisfying the demands on $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1}, \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2}$ in 4.1. For $\mathbf{I}_2^*$ the demands are just clauses (b),(c) from 2.2(1) and (*) (i) of 4.1 so just choose $\mathbf{I}_2 \subseteq H_2$ such that $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{I}_2$ and $\langle g(G_0 \cap H_2) : g \in \mathbf{I}_2 \rangle$ is a partition and then let $\mathbf{I}_2^*$ be such that $\mathbf{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_2^* \subseteq G_2$ and $\langle gG_0 : g \in \mathbf{I}_2^* \rangle$ is a partition of G_2 .

For $\mathbf{I}_1^*$ we have to take care also of (*) (e) (the parallel of (*) (i)) and (*) (f). For this let $H_1^+ := \langle G_0, H_1 \rangle_{G_1}$; first choose $\mathbf{I}'_1 = L$ so $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{I}'_1$ and $\langle gG_0 : g \in \mathbf{I}'_1 \rangle$ is a partition of H_1^+ , recalling that $L \subseteq H_1 \in G_1$, $L \cap G_0 = \{e_{G_0}\}$ by clause (A)(d) this is satisfied. Also let $\mathbf{J}_1$ be such that $e_{G_0} = e_{G_1} \in \mathbf{J}_1$ and $\langle gH_1^+ : g \in \mathbf{J}_1 \rangle$ is a partition of G_1 . Now let $\mathbf{I}_1^* = \{gb : b \in \mathbf{J}_1 \text{ and } g \in \mathbf{I}'_1\}$.

Clearly $\langle gG_0 : g \in \mathbf{I}_1^* \rangle = \langle g(bG_0) : g \in \mathbf{I}_1, b \in \mathbf{J}_1 \rangle$ is a partition of G_1 (refining $\langle gH_1^+ : g \in \mathbf{J}_1 \rangle$) and its restriction to L is the partition to singletons.

Next as $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{J}_1$ and $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{I}_1$ clearly $e_{G_0} \in \mathbf{I}_1^*$. Also if $g \in \mathbf{I}_1^* \wedge b \in \mathbf{I}'_1$ then for some $g_1 \in \mathbf{J}_1, b_1 \in \mathbf{I}'_1$ we have $G_1 \models "g = g_1 b_1"$ hence $G_1 \models "gb = (g_1 b_1)b = g_1(b_1 b)"$ and so $g_1 \in \mathbf{J}_1$ and $b_1 b \in \mathbf{I}'_1$ as $\mathbf{I}'_1 = L$ is closed under product; so together $gb \in \mathbf{I}_1^*$. So $\mathbf{I}_1^*, \mathbf{I}_2^*$ are as required in 2.2(1) hence there is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}}$ such that $G_{\mathbf{x},\ell} = G_\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},\ell} = \mathbf{I}_\ell^*$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

2) Consider part (B) of 4.3, the "if $\mathbf{x} \in \dots$ " is not empty so G_3 is well defined, but is it locally finite? This follows from the results in §2, in particular 2.11. That

is, as there if G_ℓ is finite, $G_0 \subseteq G'_\ell \subseteq G_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then we have finitely many possible choices of $(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},1} \cap x_1 G'_1, \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{x},2} \cap x_2 G'_2)$ for $x_1 \in G_1, x_2 \in G_2$ hence the group G_3 we get is locally finite. $\square_{4.4}$

§ 4(B). **Schemes and derived sets.**

Definition 4.5. 1) Let $\mathbf{X}_0$ be the set of $\mathbf{x}$ such that

- (a) $\mathbf{x}$ has the form $(K_1, K_2, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_1) = (K_1[\mathbf{x}], K_2[\mathbf{x}], \bar{a}_2[\mathbf{x}], \bar{a}_1[\mathbf{x}])$
- (b) $K_1 \subseteq K_2$ are finite groups
- (c) $\bar{a}_1$ is a finite sequence generating K_1
- (d) $\bar{a}_2$ is a finite sequence from K_2 such that $\bar{a}_2 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_1$ generates K_2 (if $\bar{a}_2 = \langle a_2 \rangle$ we may write just a_2)
- (e) K_1 has trivial center

2) Let $\mathbf{X}_1$ be the set of $\mathbf{x}$ such that

- (a) $\mathbf{x} = (K, \bar{a}) = (K[\mathbf{x}], \bar{a}[\mathbf{x}])$
- (b) $K \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ is finite
- (c) $\bar{a}$ is a finite sequence from K .

3) Let $\mathbf{X}_2$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_1$ such that

- (*) K has trivial center.

4) Let $\mathbf{X}_3$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_2$ such that

- (*) if f is a non-trivial automorphism of K then for some conjugate b of $a_* = a_*[\mathbf{x}] := a_0[\mathbf{x}]$ we have $f(b) \notin \langle a_* \rangle_K$.

Observation 4.6. If $m \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ then for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_3$ the element $a_*[\mathbf{x}] \in K_2[\mathbf{x}]$ has order m .

Definition/Claim 4.7. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_0$ we define $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that

- (a) $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$
- (b) $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = \ell g(\bar{a}_1[\mathbf{x}])$ and $n_{\mathfrak{s}} = \ell g(\bar{a}_2[\mathbf{x}])$
- (c) $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_1[\mathbf{x}], \emptyset, K[\mathbf{x}])$
- (d) if $G_1 \subseteq G_3 \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, \emptyset, G_1) = \text{tp}(\bar{a}_1[\mathbf{x}], \emptyset, K[\mathbf{x}])$ and $\bar{c}$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_0, G_1)$ in G_2 then $\text{NF}^3(\langle \bar{a}_1 \rangle_{G_1}, G_1, \langle \bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{c} \rangle_{G_3}, G_3)$.

Proof. As in §2 using §(4A). $\square$

Definition/Claim 4.8. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_2$ we define $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{\text{gm}}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that

- (a) $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$
- (b) $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 2\ell g(\bar{a}[\mathbf{x}])$ and $n_{\mathfrak{s}} = 1$
- (c) if $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_\ell, \emptyset, G_1) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}[\mathbf{x}], \emptyset, K[\mathbf{x}])$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\langle \bar{a}_1 \rangle_{G_1}, \langle \bar{a}_2 \rangle_{G_1}$ commute in G_1 and have intersection $\{e_G\}$ then $p_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{x}_{\mathfrak{s}}) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2, \emptyset, G_1)$
- (d) moreover, in clause (c), if $c \in G_2$ realizes $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2, G_1)$ in G_2 then conjugation by c interchanges $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2$ and is the identity on $\text{Cm}_{G_1}(\bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2)$.

Proof. Note that, by inspection, $G_0 = \langle \bar{a}_1 \hat{\ } \bar{a}_2 \rangle_{G_1}$ is finite with trivial center. Now use 4.1. $\square$

Definition/Claim 4.9. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_1$ let $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}(\mathbf{x})}$ be such that:

- (a) $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$
- (b) $k_{\mathfrak{s}} = 0$
- (c) if $\bar{c}$ realizes $q_2(\langle \cdot \rangle, G_1)$ in G_2 so $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ then $\bar{c}$ realizes $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}[\mathbf{x}], \emptyset, K[\mathbf{x}])$ and commute with G_1 and $\langle \bar{c} \rangle_{G_2} \cap G_2 = \{e\}$.

Proof. Easy. $\square$

Definition 4.10. 1) For $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ and $G_2 \subseteq G_2$ let $\text{cp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(G_1, G_2) = \{c_0 : \bar{c} \in {}^{n(\mathfrak{s})}(G_2) \text{ realizes } q_t(G_2) \text{ where } t \in \text{def}(G_1) \text{ satisfies } \mathfrak{s}_t = \mathfrak{s}\}$.

2) For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_2$ and $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ let $\text{cp}_{\mathbf{x}}(G_1, G_2) = \text{cp}_{\mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}[\mathbf{x}]}}(G_1, G_2)$.

3) For $G_1 \subseteq G_2 \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ let $\text{cp}_{\ell}(G_1, G_2) = \cup \{\text{cp}_{\mathbf{x}}(G_1, G_2) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{\ell}\}$; if $\ell = 2$ we may omit it.

§ 4(C). Larger Definable Types.

Definition 4.11. 1) For $G \in \mathbf{K}$, $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ and set I let $\text{Def}_{I, < \kappa}(G, \mathfrak{S})$ be the set of t such that

- (a) $t = \langle t_u : u \subseteq I \text{ finite} \rangle$
- (b) $t_u \in \text{def}_{\mathfrak{S}}(G)$ with $\bar{x}_{t_u} = \langle x_i : i \in u \rangle$ and $\bar{a}_{t_u} = \bar{a}_t$ or pedantically $\bar{a}_{t_u} = \bar{a}_t \upharpoonright w_u$ where $w_u \subseteq \ell g(\bar{a}_t)$ is finite
- (c) $\ell g(\bar{a}_t)$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ and $\text{Rang}(\bar{a}_t) \subseteq G$
- (d) if $G \subseteq H \subseteq L \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $u \subseteq v \subseteq I$ are finite and $\bar{b} \in {}^v L$ realizes $q_{t_v}(H)$ then $\bar{b} \upharpoonright u$ realizes $q_{t_u}(H)$.

2) We define $\Omega_{I, < \kappa}[\mathbf{K}, \mathfrak{S}]$ parallelly.

3) If $t \in \text{Def}_{I, < \kappa}(G, \mathfrak{S})$ then $q_t(G) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^I(G)$ is defined by $\cup \{q_{t_u}(\langle x_i : i \in u \rangle) : u \subseteq I \text{ finite}\}$.

4) Omitting κ means $\aleph_0$. We may replace “ $< \kappa^+$ ” by κ and even a set I_1 . We may replace I by “ $< \mu$ ” meaning “some $\chi < \mu$ ”.

5) For $n < \omega$ and $\mathfrak{s}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{n-1} \in \Omega_{< \mu, < \kappa}[\mathbf{K}]$ we define $\mathfrak{s}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{n-1}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{s}_{n-1}$ naturally.

Claim 4.12. 1) If $G \in \mathbf{K}$, $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ and $t \in \text{Def}_I(G, \mathfrak{S})$ then for some pair $(\bar{c}, H)$ we have $G \subseteq H \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$, $\bar{c} \in {}^I H$, $H = \langle G \cup \bar{c} \rangle_H$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G, H) = q_t(G)$.

2) If $\mathfrak{S}$ is closed then above $G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} H$.

Definition 4.13. Assume $\bar{H} = \langle H_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing in $\mathbf{K}$ and $H_{\delta} = \cup \{H_i : i < \delta\}$. We say $\mathcal{A}$ is a one step $(< \mu, < \kappa, \delta, \mathfrak{S}) - \otimes$ -construction (if $\delta = \omega$ we may omit it) when: as in 3.15 except that

- (c)' $t_{\alpha, i} \in \text{Def}_{I_{\alpha, i}, < \kappa}(H_i, \mathfrak{S})$ for some set $I_{\alpha, i}$ of cardinality $< \mu$.

The case we shall actually use in §5 is:

Claim 4.14. *Assume $K \subseteq L \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$, K is finite and f embeds K into G_1 and $\langle c_i : i < \mu \rangle$ list the members of L and $\{c_\ell : \ell < n\}$ is the set of elements of K . Then there is $t \in \text{Def}_{\leq \mu}(G_1, \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}])$ such that: if $\bar{c}^* = \langle c_i^* : i < \mu \rangle \in {}^\mu(G_2)$ realizes $q_t(G_1)$ in G_2 , so $G_1 \subseteq G_2$ then $c_i \mapsto c_i^*$ (for $i < \mu$) is an embedding of L into G_2 extending f .*

Remark 4.15. Compare with [Sh:F1120, 3.10=d43].

Proof. Straight by §2.

□_{4.14}

Discussion 4.16. Those definable types are still locally definable over finite sets.

§ 5. CONSTRUCTING SIMPLE EXISTENTIAL CLOSED G

Theorem 5.1. 1) If $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ and $|G| \leq \mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$ then there is a complete $G' \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$ which extend G such that $|G'| = \mu^+$ and G' is existentially closed.
 2) Moreover $G \leq_{\Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]} G'$ and G' is $\Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ -full.
 3) There is G' such that $G \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G'$ and $G' \in \mathbf{K}_{\mu^+}^{\text{exl}}$ is complete and $\mathfrak{S}$ -full provided that $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ is close enough in a suitable sense including:

- (*) (α) $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$
- (β) $\mathfrak{S}$ is dense and closed (for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$).

Proof. Proof of 5.1

We let $\mathfrak{S} = \Omega[\mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}]$ for parts (1),(2) and fix $\mathfrak{S}$ for part (3) as there.

Stage A: Without loss of generality the universe of G is an ordinal $\leq \mu$ and let $\lambda = \mu^+$.

Let $S \subseteq S_{\aleph_0}^\lambda := \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ be a stationary subset of λ such that also $S_{\aleph_0}^\lambda \setminus S$ is stationary in λ and $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow (\mu \text{ divides } \alpha)$. Let $\langle S_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ a partition of S to stationary sets. Let $S_* \subseteq \lambda \setminus S$ be stationary and a set of limit ordinals.

Let C_δ be an unbounded subset of δ of order type ω for $\delta \in S$ such that $\bar{C}_\zeta = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S_\zeta \rangle$ guess clubs for each $\zeta < \lambda$, this means that for every club E of λ the set $\{\delta \in S_\zeta : C_\delta \subseteq E\}$ is a stationary subset of λ ; such $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S_\zeta \rangle$ exists by [Sh:g, Ch.III] = [Sh:365].

Let $\alpha_\delta(n)$ be the n -th member of C_δ .

Let $\bar{\tau}$ be such that:

- $\bar{\tau} = \langle \tau_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$
- $\tau_\zeta \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ is a countable vocabulary
- if $\tau \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ is a countable vocabulary then $\{\zeta : \tau_\zeta = \tau\}$ has cardinality λ .

By [Sh:309, 3.24(3)] there is $\mathbf{b}_\zeta$, a BB, black box for $(S_\zeta, \bar{C}_\zeta)$ say $\mathbf{b}_\zeta = \langle N_i^\delta : i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta, \delta \in S_\zeta \rangle$, that is

- ⊞_{0, \zeta} (a) N_η^δ is a model of cardinality $\aleph_0$ with universe $\subseteq \delta = \sup(N_i^\delta)$ and vocabulary $\tau_\zeta \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$
- (b) if N is a τ_ζ -model with universe λ then for stationarily many $\delta \in E_N \cap S_\zeta$ for some $i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ we have $C_\delta \subseteq E_N \setminus S$ where $E_N := \{\alpha : N \restriction \alpha \prec N\}$ and $N_i^\delta \prec N$; moreover
- (b)⁺ if $\tau = \tau_\zeta$, $\bar{N} = \langle N_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{T} \rangle$, $\mathcal{T}$ a non-empty subtree of ${}^\omega \lambda$ such that $\tau(N_\eta) = \tau_\zeta$, $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow N_\eta \prec N_\nu$ and $|N_\eta| \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ and E a club of λ , $\eta \in \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow (\exists^\lambda \alpha)(\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in \mathcal{T})$ and $\eta \triangleleft \nu \in \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow \sup(N_\eta) < \sup(N_\nu)$ then for some $\delta \in S_\zeta \cap E$ and $i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ and $\eta \in \lim_\omega(\mathcal{T})$ we have $N_i^\delta = \cup \{N_\eta \restriction n : n < \omega\}$
- (c) if $i \neq j \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ then $N_i^\delta \cap N_j^\delta$ is bounded in δ (used just after (*)_{5.5}) moreover
- (c)⁺ if $i \neq j \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ then the set $\{\beta < \delta : \beta \text{ a limit ordinal such that } \sup(N_i^\delta \cap \beta) = \beta = \sup(N_j^\delta \cap \beta)\}$ is bounded in δ
- (d) $N_i^\delta \cap (\alpha_\delta(n), \alpha_\delta(n+1)) \neq \emptyset$ and $N_i^\delta \restriction \alpha_\delta(n) \prec N_i^\delta$ for $n < \omega$, $\delta \in S$, $i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$.

Stage B: By induction on $\gamma < \lambda$ we shall choose the following

- $\boxplus_1$ (a) $G_\gamma \in K_{\text{If}}$ of cardinality μ
 (b) $G_0 = G$
 (c) $\langle G_\beta : \beta \leq \gamma \rangle$ is increasing continuous
 (d) if $\beta \in \gamma \setminus S$ then $G_\beta \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_\gamma$ and the universe of G_γ is an ordinal $< \lambda$
 (e) if $\gamma = \beta + 1, \beta \notin S$, then
 (α) G_γ is generated by $\{\bar{c}_{\beta,i} : i \in \mathcal{T}_\beta\} \cup G_\beta$
 (β) $t_{\beta,i} \in \text{Def}_{\leq \mu}(M_\beta, \mathfrak{S})$, non-trivial see Definition 4.11
 (γ) $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_{\beta,i}, G_\beta, G_\gamma; \mathbf{K}_{\text{If}}) = q_{t_{\beta,i}}(G_\beta)$
 (δ) if $n < \omega$ and $i(0), \dots, i(n-1) \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$ are pairwise distinct then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}_{\beta,i(*)} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{\beta,i(n_2)}, G_\beta, G_\gamma; \mathbf{K}_{\text{If}}) = q_t(G_\beta)$ where $t = t_{\beta,i(0)} \otimes \dots \otimes t_{\beta,i(n-1)}$
 (ε) if $t = (\mathfrak{s}, \bar{a}) \in \text{def}(G_\beta)$ is non-trivial then for some ordinal $i, t_{\beta,i} = t$.
 (f) if $\gamma = \delta + 1, \delta \in S$ then
 (α) G_γ is generated by $\{\bar{c}_{\delta,i} : i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta\} \cup G_\delta$
 (β) $\mathcal{A}_\gamma = (G_{\delta+1}, G_\delta, \langle \bar{c}_{\delta,i}, t_{\delta,i} : i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta \rangle)$ is a one step $(< \aleph_0, < \aleph_0, \mathfrak{S}) - \otimes$ -construction over $\langle G_{\alpha_\delta(n)} : n < \omega \rangle$, see 3.15; used in $(*)_{5.2}$'s proof¹⁰.

First we shall show:

$\boxplus_2$ we can carry the induction.

Why? For $\gamma = 0$ we have nothing to do by clause (b).

For γ limit we let $G_\gamma = \cup \{G_\beta : \beta < \gamma\}$.

For $\gamma = \beta + 1, \beta \notin S$ we have some freedom, as we have $t_{\beta,i} \in \text{Def}_{\leq \mu}(G_\beta, \mathfrak{S})$ not just $\text{def}(G_\beta, \mathfrak{S})$ so let $\mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \text{Def}_{\leq \mu}(G_\beta, \mathfrak{S})$ be of cardinality $\leq \mu$, include $\text{def}(G_\beta, \mathfrak{S})$ let $\langle t_{\beta,i} = (\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,i}, \bar{a}_{\beta,i}) : i < \mu \rangle$ list $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ possibly with repetitions, clearly $\boxplus_1(e)(\varepsilon)$ holds.

Now as in 3.13 we can find $G_\gamma, \langle \bar{c}_{\beta,i} : i < \mu \rangle$ such that:

- $G_\beta \leq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_\gamma$
- $G_\gamma = \langle \{\bar{c}_{\beta,i} : i < \mu\} \cup G_\beta \rangle_{G_\gamma}$
- if $n < \omega$ and $i_k < \mu$ for $k < n$ and $\langle i_k : k < n \rangle$ is with no repetitions then

$$\bar{c}_{\beta,i_0} \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \bar{c}_{\beta,i_{n-1}} \text{ realizes } q_t(M_{\mathbf{n}_\beta}) \text{ where } t = t_{\beta,i_0} \otimes \dots \otimes t_{\beta,i_{n-1}}.$$

If $\gamma = \beta + 1, \beta \in S$ we can let $t_{\delta,i} = \text{ab}(2)$, clearly we satisfy clause (f); but we may act differently. Clearly, as in the previous case, there is some freedom left: what we do for $\gamma = \delta + 1, \delta \in S$ and this will depend on the $\langle N_i^\delta : i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta \rangle$ from $\boxplus_0$. During the rest of the proof we shall use (some of the freedom left) to guarantee that G_* (see below) is as required.

Of course, we let:

$$\boxplus_3 \ G_* = G_\lambda = \cup \{G_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}.$$

We now point out some useful properties of the construction

¹⁰actually can use one step $(\leq \mu, < \aleph_0, \mathfrak{S}) - \otimes$ -construction

- (*)_{3.1} there is a model N_* expanding G_* so with universe λ and countable vocabulary such that for any $N \subseteq N_*$ we have
- (a) $G_* \upharpoonright N$ is a subgroup of G_*
 - (b) $\beta \in N$ iff $N \cap G_{\beta+1} \setminus G_\beta \neq \emptyset$ iff $\beta + 1 \in N$
 - (c) if $\gamma = \beta + 1, \gamma \in N$ then $N \cap G_\gamma = \langle \cup \{ \bar{c}_{\beta,i} : i \in N \cap \mathcal{T}_\beta \} \cup (N \cap G_\beta) \rangle_{G_\gamma}$
 - (d) if $i \in N \cap \mu$ and $\beta \in N$ and then $|\ell g(\bar{c}_{\beta,i})| \leq \aleph_0 \Rightarrow \bar{c}_{\beta,i} \subseteq N \cap G_{\beta+1}$
and $|\ell g(\bar{a}_{t_{\beta,i}})| \leq \aleph_0 \Rightarrow \bar{a}_{t_{\beta,i}} \subseteq N \cap G_\beta$
 - (e) $\tau(G_*) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$, but $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_0) \setminus \tau(G_*)$ is infinite
 - (f) if $\delta \in N \cap S$ then $C_\delta \subseteq N$.

Now note

- (*)_{3.2} if $\alpha < \lambda$ is a limit ordinal then $G_\alpha \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$.

[Why? Recall clause (e)(ε) of $\boxplus_1$ noting that S is a set of limit ordinals.]

We now assume

$\boxplus_4$ $\mathbf{h}$ is an automorphism of G_* .

We shall eventually prove that $\mathbf{h}$ is an inner automorphism, i.e. $b \in G_* \Rightarrow \mathbf{h}(b) = a^{-1}ba$ for some $a \in G_*$, this clearly suffices noting that G_* has no center as $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{cg}} \in \mathfrak{S}$.

We shall often use

- (*)_{4.1} for limit $\beta \in \lambda \setminus S$ let $L_\beta^* = \text{cp}(G_\beta, G_{\beta+\omega})$ see 4.10, i.e. $c \in L_\beta^*$ iff for some finite $K \subseteq \text{Cm}_{G_{\beta+\omega}}(G_\beta)$ with trivial center we have $c \in K$ and $K \cap G_\beta = \{e_{G_\beta}\}$.

Note that

- (*)_{4.2} the last demand in (*)_{4.1}, “ $K \cap G_\beta = \{e_{G_\beta}\}$ ” is redundant.

[Why? As β is a limit ordinal hence by (*)_{3.2} it has trivial center.]

Note

- (*)_{4.3} if $a \in L_\beta^*$ and K witness it then $K \subseteq L_\beta^*$, moreover there is $L \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$ included in L_β^* and including K .

[Why? We can choose $\bar{K} = \langle K_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ such that $K_0 = K, K_n$ is a finite group with trivial center, $K_n \subseteq K_{n+1}$ and $\bigcup_n K_n \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{exlf}}$. We now choose by induction on n an embedding f_n of K_n into $G_{\beta+\omega}$ such that $f_0 = \text{id}_K, f_n \subseteq f_{n+1}$. Now $\bigcup_n f_n(K_n)$ is as required.]

We shall use

- (*)_{4.4} let $E_{\mathbf{h}} = \{\delta : \delta \text{ is a limit ordinal and } \mathbf{h} \text{ maps } G_\delta \text{ onto } G_\delta\}$.

Now

- (*)_{4.5} $E_{\mathbf{h}}$ is a club of λ .

[Why? Just look at (*)_{4.4}.]

Stage C: We shall prove

$\boxplus_5$ for some $\alpha(*) < \lambda$, for every $\beta \in S_* \cap E_{\mathbf{h}} \setminus \alpha(*)$ and $m \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $c \in L_\beta^*$ we have $\mathbf{h}(c) \in \text{cl}(G_{\alpha(*)} \cup \{c\})$.

Why? If not, for every $\alpha < \lambda$ there are $\beta_\alpha \in S_* \cap E_{\mathbf{h}} \setminus \alpha$, $m(\alpha) = m_\alpha \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $c_\alpha \in L_\beta^*$ of order m_α such that $\mathbf{h}(c_\alpha) \notin \text{cl}(G_\alpha \cup \{c_{\alpha,0}\})$ and $\bar{c}_\alpha$ witness $c_\alpha \in L_\beta^*$ with $c_{\alpha,0} = c_\alpha$, i.e. $\bar{c}_\alpha$ list the members of a finite subgroup of $G_{\beta_\alpha + \omega}$ with trivial center. Let $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \in X_1$ be such that $\bar{c}_\alpha$ realize $q_{\text{sab}}[\mathbf{x}_\alpha](\langle \rangle, G_{\beta_\alpha})$, see 4.5(2) + 4.9. But if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ then $(\beta_{\alpha_2}, c_{\alpha_2}, m_{\alpha_2})$ can serve as $(\beta_{\alpha_1}, c_{\alpha_1}, m_{\alpha_1})$ hence without loss of generality $\mathbf{x}_\alpha = \mathbf{x}$, $m_\alpha = m_*$ for every α .

- (*)_{5.1} (a) Let $\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} = \bar{c}_\alpha$; let $k_{\alpha,1} < \omega$ be such that $\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} \subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,1} + 1}$, $\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} \not\subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,1}}$.
- (b) Let $k_{\alpha,*} \in (k_{\alpha,1} + 1, \omega)$ be such that: $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\mathbf{h}(\bar{b}_{\alpha,1}), G_{\beta_\alpha + \omega}, G_*) = q_t(\bar{a}_t, G_{\beta_\alpha + \omega})$ for some $t \in \mathfrak{S}$ with $\bar{a}_t \subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,*}}$.
- (c) Let $\bar{b}_{\alpha,2} \subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + \omega}$ realize $q_{\text{sab}}[\mathbf{x}](\langle \rangle, G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,*} + 1})$.
- (d) Let $k_{\alpha,2} < \omega$ be such that $\bar{b}_{\alpha,2} \subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,2} + 1}$, $\bar{b}_{\alpha,2} \not\subseteq G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,2}}$ so actually $k_{\alpha,2} = k_{\alpha,*} + 1$.
- (e) Note that $\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} \hat{\ } \bar{b}_{\alpha,2}$ realizes $p_{\text{s}_{\text{gm}}}(\bar{x})$
- (f) Let $k_{\alpha,3} < \omega$ be $> k_{\alpha,1}, k_{\alpha,2}$ and let $b_{\alpha,3} \in G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,3} + 1}$ realizes $q_{\text{s}_{\text{gm}}}[\mathbf{x}_m](\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} \hat{\ } \bar{b}_{\alpha,2}, G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,3}}, G_{\beta_\alpha})$ so it commutes with $\text{Cm}_{G_{\beta_\alpha + k_{\alpha,2} + 1}}(\bar{b}_{\alpha,1} \hat{\ } \bar{b}_{\alpha,2})$ hence with G_{β_α} and conjugating by it interchange $\bar{b}_{\alpha,1}, \bar{b}_{\alpha,2}$, see 4.8.

Let N be such that

- (*)_{5.2} (a) N is a model with universe λ
- (b) N is with countable vocabulary
- (c) N expands N_* from (*)_{3.1}
- (d) • $F_0^N = h$, so F_0 a unary function symbol
- $F_{1,\ell}^N(\alpha) = b_{\alpha,\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\ell < \ell g(\bar{b}_{\alpha,\ell})$: if $\ell = 0$ we may omit it
- $F_{1,3}^N(\alpha) = b_{\alpha,3}$
- $F_2^N(\alpha) = \beta_\alpha$
- $F_{2,\ell}(\alpha) = \beta_{\alpha,\ell} + k_{\alpha,\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$
- $F_3^N(\alpha) = \beta_\alpha + \omega$
- (e) $F_{4,n}^N$ is a $(n+1)$ -place function such that: if $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_n, c_{\alpha_\ell} \in G_{\alpha_\ell + 1}$, each α_ℓ is a limit ordinal then $F_{4,n}^N(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is the product of $a_0 a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$ where $a_k = F_{1,3}(\alpha_k)$
- (f) $P^N = \{(\alpha, c) : \alpha < \lambda \text{ and } c \in G_\alpha\}$.

Without loss of generality $\tau_N \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$, choose $\zeta(1) < \lambda$ be such that $\tau_{\zeta(1)} = \tau_N$ and for the $\delta \in S_{\zeta(1)}$ we use the amount of freedom we are left with (see before $\boxplus_3$) choosing $G_{\delta+1}$ such that

- (*)_{5.3} if $\delta \in S_{\zeta(1)}, i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ letting $\alpha_{\delta,i,n} := \min(N_i^\delta \setminus \alpha_\delta(n))$ then (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) where
- (a) • $\beta_{\delta,i,n} := F_2^{N_i^\delta}(\alpha_{\delta,i,n})$ is $\geq \alpha_{\delta,i,n}$ but $< \alpha_\delta(n+1)$

- $F_3^{N_i^\delta}(\alpha_{\delta,i,n}) = \beta_{\delta,i,n} + \omega$
 - $b_{\delta,i,n,\iota} = F_{1,\iota}^{N_i^\delta}(\alpha_{\delta,i,n})$ and $b_{\delta,n,\iota,\ell} = F_{1,\iota,\ell}^N(\alpha_{\delta,i,n})$ for $\iota = 1, 2$ and ℓ
 - $k_{\delta,i,n,\iota} = F_{2,\iota}^{N_i^\delta}(\alpha_{\delta,i,n}) = \alpha_{\delta,i,n}$ for $\iota = 1, 2, 3$
as in (*) so $b_{\delta,i,n,\iota} \in G_{\beta_{\delta,i,n}+k_{\delta,i,n,\iota}+1}$ commute with $G_{\beta_{\delta,i,n}}$ and conjugating by $b_{\delta,i,n,3}$ interchange $b_{\delta,i,n,1}, b_{\delta,i,n,2}$
 - $b_{\delta,i,n,3} = F_{1,3}^{N_i^\delta}(\beta_{\delta,i,n})$
 - δ is the set of elements of G_δ
 - for every $\beta < \delta$ we have $(G_{\beta+1} \setminus G_\beta) \cap N_i^\delta \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \beta \in N_{\delta,i}$
 - if $\beta \in N_i^\delta \setminus S$ and $\bar{c} \in \omega^{>}(N_i^\delta)$ so $\bar{c} \in \omega^{>}(G_\delta)$ then $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G_\beta, G_\delta) \in q_t(G_\beta)$ for some $t \in \text{def}(G_\beta)$ satisfying $\bar{a}_t \in \omega^{>}(N_i^\delta \cap G_\beta)$
- (b) $\bar{c}_{\delta,i} = \langle c_{\delta,i} \rangle$ and $\text{tp}(c_{\delta,i}, G_\delta, G_{\delta+1})$ is as in claim 2.20 with $G_{\alpha_\delta(n)}(n < \omega), G_\delta, b_{\beta_{\delta,i,n,3}} \in N_i^\delta(n < \omega)$ here standing for $G_n(n < \omega), G_\omega, a_n(n < \omega)$ there
- (*)_{5.4} if the assumption of clause (a) fails, $\mathfrak{s}_{\delta,i} = \mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}(2)}$.

Why can we fulfill (*)_{5.3}? Let $\langle i_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle$ be a finite sequence of members of $\mathcal{T}_\delta$. For $\ell < \ell(*)$ and $n < \omega$ let $d_{\ell,n} = b_{\delta,i_\ell,n,3}$.

Now

- (*)_{5.5} $\langle d_{\ell,n} : n < \omega \rangle$ pairwise commute.

[Why? As $b_{\delta,i(\ell),n,3} \in \text{Cm}(G_{\beta_{\delta,i(\ell),n}}, G_{\beta_{\delta,i(\ell),n}+\omega})$ for $n < \omega$ and $\beta_{\delta,i(\ell),n} + \omega < \alpha_\delta(n+1) \leq \alpha_{\delta,i(\ell),n+1} \leq \beta_{\delta,i(\ell),n+1}$ recalling $N_\delta^i \upharpoonright \alpha_\delta(n+1) \prec N_\delta^i$ and $N_\delta^i \cap (\alpha_\delta(n), \alpha_\delta(n+1)) \neq \emptyset$.]

- (*)_{5.6} if $\ell(1) \neq \ell(2)$ then for every $n(1) < n(2)$ the elements $b_{\delta,i(\ell(1)),n(1),3}, b_{\delta,i(\ell(2)),n(2),3}$ commute.

[Why? Recall that $b_{\delta,i(\ell(1)),n(1),3} \in G_{\alpha_\delta(n(2))} \subseteq G_{\beta_{\delta,i(\ell(2)),n(2)}}$; note that $b_{\delta,i,n,\iota} \in G_{\beta_{\delta,i,n,\iota}+\omega}$ commute with $G_{\beta_{\delta,i,n}}$ rather than with $G_{\alpha_{\delta,i,n}}$ but not used.]

- (*)_{5.7} for $\ell(1), \ell(2) < \ell(*)$, for n large enough, for every $n(1), n(2) \in (n, \omega)$ the elements $d_{\ell(1),n(1)}, d_{\ell(2),n(2)}$ of G_δ commute.

[Why? Similarly as $N_{i_{\ell(1)}}^\delta \cap N_{i_{\ell(2)}}^\delta$ is bounded in δ but not used.]

- (*)_{5.8} if $\ell(*) < \omega$ and $i_\ell \in \mathcal{T}_\delta, \mathbf{i} = \langle i_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle$ with no repetition then let $p_{\langle i_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle} = \{\varphi(\langle x_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle, \bar{b}) : \varphi \text{ of the form } \sigma(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = e, \sigma \text{ a group term } \bar{b} \in \omega^{>}(G_\delta) \text{ and } (\forall^\infty n_0)(\forall^\infty n_1) \dots (G_\delta \models \varphi(\langle b_{\delta,i(0),n(0),3}, b_{\delta,i(1),n(1),3}, \dots \rangle, \bar{b}))\}$

- (*)_{5.9} $p_{\langle i_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle} \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^{\ell(*)}(G_\delta)$

- (*)_{5.10} $p_{\langle i_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle} \upharpoonright G_\beta \in \mathbf{S}_\Theta(G_\beta)$ for $\beta \in \alpha_\delta(m+1) \setminus \alpha_\delta(m) \setminus S$.

[Why? Think.]

By symmetry we finish proving we can fulfill (*)_{5.3} and obviously also (*)_{5.4} as in the proof that we can carry the induction in $\boxplus_1$.

Next let

- (*)_{5.11} $E = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ a limit ordinal is the universe of } G_\delta \text{ and } N \upharpoonright \delta \prec N \text{ hence } \mathbf{h} \text{ maps } G_\delta \text{ onto itself}\}.$

Clearly E is a club of λ , hence by $\boxplus_{0,\zeta(1)}$ from stage A, there is a pair $(\delta, i_*) = (\delta, i(*))$ such that

$$(*)_{5.12} \quad \delta \in E \cap S_{\zeta(1)} \text{ and } i_* \in \mathcal{T}_\delta \text{ and } N_{i_*}^\delta \prec N.$$

Let $d = \mathbf{h}(c_{\delta, i_*}) \in G_*$, so

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_{5.13} \quad (a) \quad & \text{the pair } (\delta, i_*) \text{ satisfies the demands in } (*)_{5.1}(a) \\ (b) \quad & \text{for some finite set } u_* \subseteq \{i : i \in \mathcal{T}_\delta\} \text{ and } \bar{b}_* \in {}^\omega(G_\delta) \\ & \text{the type } \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(d, G_{\delta+1}, G_*) \text{ does not split over} \\ & \{c_{\delta, i} : i \in u_*\} \cup \bar{b}_* \text{ and } i_* \in u_*. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? For clause (a), as $\delta \in E$ and $N_{i(*)}^\delta \prec N$, recalling the choice of N (including $\mathbf{h} = F_0^N$). For clause (b), apply properties of the construction in $\boxplus_1$, i.e. $G_{\delta+1} \subseteq_{\mathfrak{S}} G_*$.]

$$(*)_{5.14} \quad \text{conjugating by } d \text{ in } G_* \text{ interchange } b_{\delta, i(*), n, 1} \text{ with } b_{\delta, i(*), n, 2} \text{ for } n < \omega.$$

[Why? Should be clear as for $m \in \omega \setminus \{n\}$, $\iota(1), \iota(2) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $b_{\delta, i(*), m, \iota(1)}$ commute with $b_{\delta, i(*), n, \iota(2)}$.]

Recalling $\boxplus_0(c)$ there is $n(*) < \omega$ large enough such that

$$(*)_{5.15} \quad \bar{b}_* \subseteq G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}} \text{ and } j_1 \neq j_2 \in u_* \cup \{i_*\} \Rightarrow N_{j_1} \cap N_{j_2} \subseteq G_{\alpha_\delta(n(*))} \text{ and as in } \boxplus_{0, \zeta(1)}(c)^+.$$

Clearly for some $\beta(*) < \lambda$ we have $\mathbf{h}(b_{\delta, i(*), n(*), 1}) \in G_{\beta(*)+1} \setminus G_{\beta(*)}$. As $\alpha_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} = \min(N_{i(*)}^\delta \setminus \alpha_\delta(n*)) \in N_{i(*)}^\delta$, clause (d) of $\boxplus_0$ and $N_{i_*}^\delta \prec N$ clearly

$$(*)_{5.16} \quad \mathbf{h} \text{ maps } G_{\alpha_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}} \cap N_{i_*}^\delta \text{ onto itself and so } \beta(*) \in N_{i_*}^\delta \setminus \alpha_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}.$$

Also

$$(*)_{5.17} \quad \text{if } \beta(*) < \beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + \omega \text{ then } \beta(*) \leq \beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2.$$

[Why? By $(*)_{5.1}$.]

Now

$$(*)_{5.18} \quad \text{there is } \beta \in N_{i_*}^\delta \cap (\beta(*) + 1) \setminus \alpha_\delta(n(*)) \setminus S \text{ such that } [\beta, \beta(*) + \omega) \cap N_{i_*}^\delta \text{ is disjoint to } N_j^\delta \text{ if } j \in u_* \text{ but } j \neq i_*.$$

[Why? First assume $\beta(*) \notin S$, let $\beta = \beta(*)$ so clearly $\beta \in N_{i_*}^\delta$ by $(*)_{5.14}$, $\beta \in (\beta(*)+1)$, also $\beta \notin \alpha_\delta(n(*))$ as by $(*)_{5.6}$ and $\beta \notin S$ by its choice. Also $[\beta, \beta(*) + \omega) = [\beta(*), \beta(*) + \omega) \subseteq N_{i_*}^\delta$ as N is closed under $\alpha \mapsto \alpha + 1$ by $(*)_{3.1}(b)$. If $j \in u_*$ but $j \neq i_*$ then $N_j^\delta \cap N_{i_*}^\delta \subseteq \alpha_\delta(n(*)) \leq \beta$ hence $[\beta, \beta(*) + \omega) \cap N_j^\delta = \emptyset$ so we are done.

Second, assume $\beta(*) \in S$, hence $\text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0$, and by $(*)_{3.2}(f)$, $\{\alpha_{\beta(*)}(n) : n < \omega\} \subseteq N_{i_*}^\delta$. But by $\boxplus_0(c)^+$ we have $j \in u_* \wedge j \neq i_* \Rightarrow \sup(N_j^\delta \cap \beta(*)) < \beta(*)$. As u_* is finite there is $\beta \in \{\alpha_{\beta(*)}(n) : n < \omega\}$ such that $(\beta, \beta(*)) \cap N_j^\delta = \emptyset$; hence as before even $(\beta, \beta(*) + \omega) \cap N_j^\delta = \emptyset$ whenever $j \in u_* \wedge j \neq i_*$. So $(*)_{5.16}$ holds indeed.]

Case 1: $\beta(*) \geq \beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + \omega$.

So by the choice of β and the proof of $(*)_{5.3}$ the type $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(d, G_{\beta(*)+\omega}, G_*)$ does not split over G_β , even some finite subset of it.

Now by $\boxplus_1(e)$ in $G_{\beta(*)+\omega}$ there is $d' \neq \mathbf{h}(b_{\beta\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 1)$ realizing $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\mathbf{h}(b_{\beta\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 1), G_\beta, G_{\beta(*)+\omega})$ so $\mathbf{h}(b_{\beta\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 3) \notin \text{cl}_{\text{gr}}(G_\beta \cup \{d\})$. However $G_* \models d \mathbf{h}(c_{\beta\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 1) d^{-1} = \mathbf{h}(c_{\beta\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2)$, contradiction.

Case 2: $\beta(*) < \beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + \omega$.

Hence $\beta(*) \leq \beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2$ and so $\{\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\mathbf{h}(d), G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + \omega}, G_*)\}$ does not split over $G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} \cup \{b_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 3\}}$ but $\text{tp}(b_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 3, G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 3}, G_*)$ does not split over $G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} \cup \text{Rang}(\bar{b}_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 1 \cup \text{Rang}(\bar{b}_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2))$.

It follows that $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\mathbf{h}(d), G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 3}, G_*)$ does not split over $G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2}$.

Hence $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\mathbf{h}, d), G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 2+1}, G_*$ does not split over $G_{\beta_{\delta, i(*), n(*)} + k_{\delta, i(*), n(*)}, 1+1}$, contradiction.

So we have finished proving $\boxplus_5$.

Stage D:

$\boxplus_6$ (a) for some stationary $S_1^* \subseteq S_* \subseteq \lambda \setminus S$ for every $\beta \in S_* \setminus \beta(*)$ if $b \in L_\beta^*$ then $\mathbf{h}(b) = \sigma^{G_*}(b, \bar{a})$ for some $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>} (G_\beta)$ and group-term $\sigma(x, \bar{y})$

(b) moreover $\mathbf{h}(b) = \sigma^{G_*}(b)$ if $b \in L \in L_\beta$.

Why?

(*)_{6.1} clause (a) of $\boxplus_6$ holds even for every $\beta \in S_2^* := S_* \cap E_{\mathbf{h}} \setminus \alpha(*)$.

[Why? By $\boxplus_5$.]

(*)_{6.2} without loss of generality, if $\beta \in S_2^*$ and $b \in L_\beta^*$ then $\mathbf{h}(b) = \sigma_b(b) \cdot a_b$ for some $a_b \in G_\beta$.

[Why? This by (*)_{6.1} because b commutes with G_β whereas $\bar{a}_b \in {}^{\omega>} (G_\beta)$.]

(*)_{6.3} (a) $b \mapsto \sigma_b(b)$ is a homomorphism from the set L_β^* into L_β^* (but we did not claim L_β^* is a subgroup)

(b) $b \mapsto a_b$ induces a homomorphism from the set L_β^* into the group G_β , that is if $\sigma(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is a group term and $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in L$ and $G_{\beta+\omega} \models \sigma(b_0, \dots) = e$ then $G_\beta \models \sigma(a_{b_0}, \dots, a_{b_n}) = e$.

[Why? As $\mathbf{h}$ is an automorphism of G_* and as $a_{b_1}, \sigma_{b_2}(b_2)$ commute for $b_1, b_2 \in L_\beta^*$.]

We try to get rid of the homomorphism from (*)_{6.3}(b) in order to prove $\boxplus_6(b)$.

Toward contradiction assume (for the rest of this stage)

(*) $\gamma \in \lambda \setminus S$ is a limit ordinal and $b_* \in L_\gamma^*$ and $a_{b_*} \neq e$.

Now as $\gamma \in \lambda \setminus S$ we can find as sequence $\bar{f}^\gamma = \langle f_\eta^\gamma : \eta \in {}^\omega \mu \rangle$ satisfying f_η^γ is a function from $\{\eta \upharpoonright n : n < \omega\}$ into G_γ such that for every $f : {}^{\omega>} \mu \rightarrow G_\gamma$ for some $\eta \in {}^\omega \mu$ we have $f_\eta^\gamma \subseteq f$; i.e. a simple black box, see [Sh:309, §1] exists as $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$. Now generally for $\gamma \in \lambda \setminus S$ let $\mathcal{W}_\gamma = \{\eta \in {}^\omega \mu : \text{for some } c \in G_\gamma \text{ of order 2 we have } n < \omega \Rightarrow c^{-1} f(\eta \upharpoonright (2n)) c = f(\eta \upharpoonright (2n+1))\}$.

Let K_* be the group of permutation of $I = {}^{\omega>} \mu \times \{0, 1\}$ with finite support, i.e. $\{f \in \text{Per}(I) : (\exists <^{\aleph_0} t \in I)(f(t) \neq t)\}$. Let $h_\eta \in K_*$ be such that $h_*(\eta, \iota) \equiv (\eta, 1 - \iota)$ for $\iota = 0, 1$ and is the identity otherwise. Let K_γ be the group of permutations of $I = {}^{\omega>} \mu \times \{0, 1\}$ generated by $K_* \cup \{y_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>} \mu\}$ where

- (*)_{6.5} (a) if $\eta \in \mathcal{W}_\gamma$ then y_η interchange $(\eta(2n+1), \iota), (\eta(2n+2), \iota)$ for $n < \omega$, $\iota = 0, 1$ and otherwise is the identity
- (b) if $\eta \in {}^\omega\mu \setminus \mathcal{W}_\gamma$ then y_η interchange $(\eta(2n), \iota)$ with $(\eta(2n+1), \iota)$ for $n < \omega, \iota = 0, 1$ and is the identity otherwise.

Let

- d be the permutation of I interchanging $(\langle \rangle, 0), (\langle \rangle, 1)$ and the identity otherwise.

Now we shall use some of the amount of freedom left, clearly

- (*)_{6.6} (a) there is $K \subseteq \text{Cm}_{G_{\gamma+\omega}}(G_\beta)$ finite with trivial center such that $b_* \in K$
- (b) there is $\bar{b}$ which lists the member of K
- (c) there is $\bar{d}$, a finite sequence from K_γ realizing $\text{tp}(\bar{b}, \emptyset, G_*)$ such that $d_0 = b_*$
- (d) there is $n(*)$ such that $K \subseteq G_{\beta+n(*)}$
- (*)_{6.7} there is an embedding g_γ of K_γ into $\text{Cm}_{G_{\gamma+n(*)+1}}(G_\gamma)$ mapping $\bar{d}$ to $\bar{b}$ hence d_0 to b_*
- (*)_{6.8} $b \mapsto a_b$ is a homomorphism from $g_\gamma(K_\gamma)$ into G_γ
- (*)_{6.9} let $f : {}^\omega\lambda \rightarrow G_\beta$ be defined by $f(\eta) = a_{g(h_\eta)}$.

By the choice of $\langle f_\eta : \eta \in {}^\omega\mu \rangle$ for some $\eta \in {}^\omega\mu$ we have $n < \omega \Rightarrow f_\eta^\gamma(\eta \upharpoonright n) = f(\eta \upharpoonright \eta)$. By the choice of $\mathcal{W}_\gamma$ and K_γ , we get contradiction to (*)_{6.8}.

Stage E:

- $\boxplus_7$ there is a finite sequence $\bar{a}_*$ such that for every $b \in G_*$ we have $\mathbf{h}(b) \in \text{cl}(\bar{a}_* \cup \{(b, G_*)\})$.

[Why? For $\beta \in S_2^*$ let $d_\beta \in G_{\beta+1}$ realize $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{cg}}(\langle \rangle, G_\beta)$ in $G_{\beta+1}$. So for every $a \in G_\beta$ of order m as G_β is existentially closed there is an embedding f of $K_2[\mathbf{x}]$ into G_β such that $f_a(a_*[\mathbf{x}_m]) = a$. Hence the element $d_\beta a d_\beta^{-1}$ commute with G_β and belongs to $G_{\beta+1}$ and moreover to L_β^* hence, by $\boxplus_6(b)$ for some $k(a) < m$

$$(*)_{7.1} \mathbf{h}(d_\beta^{-1} a d_\beta) = (d_\beta^{-1} a d_\beta)^{k(a)}.$$

Hence

$$(*)_{7.2} \mathbf{h}(a) = \mathbf{h}(d_\beta^{-1}) \mathbf{h}(d_\beta^{-1} a d_\beta) \mathbf{h}(d_\beta^{-1}) = \mathbf{h}(d_\beta^{-1}) (d_\beta^{-1} a d_\beta)^{k(a)} \mathbf{h}(d_\beta).$$

Also, as $\beta \notin S$, there is a finite $K_\beta \subseteq G_\beta$ such that $\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\langle \mathbf{h}(d_\beta), d_\beta \rangle, G_\beta, G_*; \mathbf{K}_{\text{If}})$ does not split over K_β . By (*)_{7.2}, $\text{tp}(\mathbf{h}(a), G_\beta, G_*; \mathbf{K}_{\text{If}})$ does not split over $K_\beta \cup \{(b)\}$, but $\mathbf{h}(a) \in G_\beta$ hence $\mathbf{h}(a) \in \langle K \cup (b) \rangle_{G_*}$. By Fodor lemma this is enough for $\boxplus_7$.

Clearly we are done by 2.24:

$\square_{5.1}$

* * *

- Question 5.2.* 1) We can get 2^λ pairwise non-isomorphic such groups. But can they be pairwise far? (i.e. no $G \in \mathbf{K}$, can be embedded in two of them)?
- 2) Even more basically can we demand G_* has no uncountable Abelian group (when G does not)? Or at least no Abelian group of cardinality λ ?
- 3) Can we prove 5.1 for every $\lambda > \aleph_0$? or at least $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$?

Discussion 5.3. 1) Concerning 5.2(1), the problem with our approach is using $p \in \mathbf{S}_\Theta(G)$, so as λ is regular will get subgroups generated by indiscernible sets.

2) Concerning 5.2(2), the problem with our approach is that we use $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{\text{ab}(k)}$ and more generally $\mathfrak{s} \in \Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ such that if $q_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}, G) = \text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{c}, G, H)$ then some $c \in G \setminus H$ commute with every (or even “many”) members of G . Hence in the construction above, G_* has Abelian subgroups of cardinality λ .

3) What about considering the class of $(G, F_h)_{h \in H}$, $F_h \in \text{aut}(G)$, $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{lf}}$, $h \mapsto F_h$ a homomorphism? We shall deal with it in [Sh:F1120].

Discussion 5.4. 1) Naturally the proof of 5.1 is not unique, the class has many complicated models. In the construction in the proof of 5.1 we choose one where we realize many definable types.

2) We may like in $\boxplus_5$ of Stage C to consider $c \in G_\lambda$, not necessarily from $G_{\beta+\omega}$; (so later the role of $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{eq}}$ in translating knowledge on $\mathbf{h} \restriction G_{\beta+\omega}$ to knowledge on G_β + use of Fodor is not necessary). Presently the way we combine $\langle b_{\delta, i(\ell), n, 3} : n < \omega, \ell < \ell(*) \rangle$ to one n -type in $\mathbf{S}(G_\delta)$ works using 2.20.

§ 6. OTHER CLASSES

§ 6(A). $\mathbf{K}_{\text{plf}}$ and family.

Refer to in §0 before 0.1 and in 0.4, 2.1. We expand an lf group by choosing representations for left cosets bK , K a finite subgroup. Then the density of $\Omega[\mathbf{K}]$ is easy.

Definition 6.1. 1) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ be the class of structures M such that M is an expansion of an lf group $G = G_M$ by $F_n = F_n^M$ for $n < \omega$ such that:

- (a) F_n^M is a partial $(n+1)$ -place function from G to G
- (b) if $(a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \text{Dom}(F_n^M)$ then $\{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ list without repetitions the elements of a subgroup of G_M
- (c) if $F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_n) = b$ then $b \in \{a_n a_\ell : \ell < n\}$
- (d) if K is a finite subgroup of G_M with n elements and for some $\{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ listing its elements with no repetitions and b we have $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b) \in \text{Dom}(F_n^M)$, then for every $(a'_0, \dots, a'_{n-1})$ listing the members of K and $b' \in G_M$ we have $(a'_0, \dots, a'_{n-1}, b') \in \text{Dom}(F_n^M)$ and $b'K = bK \Rightarrow F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b') = F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b)$
- (e) if K_1, K_2 are as in clause (d) then also $K_1 \cap K_2$ is
- (f) if $A \subseteq G_M$ is finite then there is K as in clause (d) which contains A and if A is empty then $K = \{e_{G_M}\}$.

Definition 6.2. Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{plf}}$ be the class of structures M such that: M expands an lf group G by P_n^M for $n < \omega$ and F_n^M for $n < \omega$ (actually definable from the rest) such that:

- (a) P_n^M is an $(n+3)$ -place relation
- (b) if $(a_0, \dots, a_{n+2}) \in P_n^M$ then $\{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ list with no repetitions the member of a finite subgroup of G_M
- (c) if $\{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\} = \{a'_0, \dots, a'_{n-1}\}$ moreover $\{ba_0, \dots, ba_{n-1}\} = \{b'a'_0, \dots, b'a'_{n-1}\}$ then $M \models P_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b, c, d) = P_n(a'_0, \dots, a'_{n-1}, b', c, d)$ for every $c, d \in M$
- (d) if $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ list the members of a finite subgroup K of G with no repetitions and $b \in G$ then $\{(c, d) : (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b, c, d) \in P_n^M\}$ is a linear order on the right coset bK denote by $<_{K,b}^M$
- (e) if $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ are as above and $b \in G$ then $F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b)$ is the first element by the order there in $\{ba_0, \dots, ba_{n-1}\}$.

Definition 6.3. 1) For $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ let $\text{fsb}(M)$ be the set of finite subgroups K of G_M such that for some $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}$ listing with no repetitions the elements of K and for some $b \in G_M$ we have $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b) \in \text{Dom}(F_n^M)$, i.e. they are as in clause (d) of Definition 0.4.

2) In this case we may write $F_a^M(b) = F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b)$.

3) For $M, N \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ let $M \leq_{\text{elf}} N$ or $M \subseteq N$ means that $G_m \subseteq G_N$ and $F_n^M = F_n^N \upharpoonright M$ hence $K \in \text{sfb}(N) \wedge K \subseteq M \Rightarrow K \in \text{fsb}(M)$, similarly $\leq_{\text{plf}}, \leq_{\text{olf}}$. We may write $M \leq_{\mathbf{K}} N$ for the appropriate $\mathbf{K}$. etc.

4) “ $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ is (existentially closed)” is defined as in 0.1(2).

5) Let clf-group mean a member of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ and similarly an olf-group .

6) Similarly for “ plf ”.

Convention 6.4. 1) Let $\mathbf{K}$ denote one of the classes defined above, but be $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ if not said otherwise.

Definition/Claim 6.5. 1) For $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ let $M^{[\text{clf}]}$ be the unique $N \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ such that: $G_N = G_M$ and $\mathbf{k}(M) = \{K : K \subseteq G_M \text{ is finite}\}$ and $F_K^M(b)$ is the $<_M$ -first member of $\text{bK} \subseteq G$ (well defined as bK is finite non-empty).

- 1A) For $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ we define $M^{[\text{plf}]}$ and for $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{plf}}$ we define $M^{[\text{clf}]}$ paralelly.
 2) For $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ and $B \subseteq M$, there is $N \subseteq M$ from $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ with universe A iff for every finite $A \subseteq B$ there is $K \in \text{fsb}(M)$ such that $A \subseteq K \subseteq B$.
 2A) So if $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ and $K \in \text{fsb}(M)$ then $M \setminus K \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ and is finite.
 3) For $A \subseteq M \in \mathbf{K}$ let $\text{cl}(A, M)$ be the minimal $N \subseteq M$ such that $B \subseteq N$, equivalently $\cup\{K : K \in \text{fsb}(M) \text{ and } A \cap K \subseteq L \subseteq K\}$.
 4) For $A \subseteq M \in \mathbf{K}$ let $\text{cl}_{\text{gr}}(A, M)$ be the closure of A under the group operations.
 5) We call $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ full when $\text{fsb}(M)$ is the set of finite $K \subseteq M$.

- Claim 6.6.** 1) The objects in 6.5 are well defined (in the right class).
 2) If $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}}$ or $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{plf}}$ then $M^{[\text{clf}]} \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ is full.
 3) $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{K}_{\text{olf}})$ is dense.
 4) $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}})$ is dense.

Proof. 1) Straight, e.g. in part (3) for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ the closure is well defined because $\text{fsb}(M)$ is closed under intersections.

2) Easy, too.

3),4) As in §2. □6.6

Remark 6.7. Call $M \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{clf}}$ invariant when for every finite $K \subseteq G_\mu$ there is a function $F_K^M : G \rightarrow G$ such that $F_K^M(g) \in gK$ and is equal to $F_n^M(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ when $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}$ list the members of K with no repetitions. Restricting ourselves to such M seems to cause problems in amalgamations, whereas for $\mathbf{K}_{\text{plc}}$ this is not so.

Definition 6.8. For $M \in \mathbf{K}$ and $n < \omega$ let $\mathbf{S}_{\text{gd}}^n(M)$ be the set of good n -types $p(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(M)$ which means: $p = \text{tp}(\bar{a}, M, N)$ where $M \subseteq N \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^n N$ and $\text{cl}_{\text{gr}}(\bar{a} + M, N) = \text{cl}(\bar{a} + M, N)$.

Claim 6.9. Those classes $\mathbf{K}$ has dense closed $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \Omega[K]$.

Proof. Straight. □

* * *

Definition 6.10. 1) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{sl}}$ be the class of locally finite semi-groups, i.e. G , i.e. it has only one operation, binary which is associative.

2) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{usl}}$ be defined similarly with an individual constant e such that $G \models ge_G = g = e_G g$ for every $g \in G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{usl}}$.

Question 6.11. 1) Replacing **I?** Maybe: linearly order $G_\ell \setminus G_0$ by $<_\ell$ and G_0 by $<_0$ and let $\mathcal{U}_x = \{(g_0, g_1, g_2) : \bigwedge_\ell g_\ell \in G_\ell \text{ and if } G_\ell \models g_\ell g_0 = g'_\ell g'_0\}$.

2) The problem is: $g_\ell \in G_\ell, G_1 \models g_1 g_0 = g_1 g'_0 \wedge G_2 \models g_2 g_0 \neq g_2 g'_0$ so every amalgamation will identify $g_2 g_0, g_2 g'_0$.

Definition 6.12. 1) Let $\mathbf{T}_K$ be the set of tuples $= (G, I, \bar{K}, \bar{A})$ or $(M, I, \bar{K}, \bar{A}) = (M_{\mathbf{m}}, I_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{K}_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{A})$ where $M \in \mathbf{K}$, I a directed partial order; $\bar{K} = \langle K_s : s \in I \rangle = \langle K_{\mathbf{m},s} : s \in I \rangle$ where $K_s \in \text{fs}(M)$ and $s \leq_I t \Rightarrow K_s \subseteq K_t \wedge A_s \subseteq A_t \subseteq K_t$ and $\bigcup_{t \in I} K_t = M$.

2) Let $D_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the following filter on $I_{\mathbf{M}}\{A \subseteq I : A \subseteq \{K_t : t \text{ satisfies } s \leq_I t\} \text{ for some } s \in I\}$.

3) Let $\mathbf{S}_{\text{bs}}^n(\mathbf{m}) = \{\text{tp}_{\text{bs}}(\bar{a}, M_{\mathbf{m}}, N) : M_{\mathbf{m}} \subseteq N \in \mathbf{K}, \bar{a} \in {}^m N \text{ and with an } \mathbf{m}\text{-witness } \mathbf{I}\}$ which means

- (1) $\boxplus \mathbf{I} \subseteq N, \langle gM_{\mathbf{m}} : g \in \mathbf{I} \rangle$ a partition of N and for some $s \in M_{\mathbf{m}}$ we have if $s \leq_I t$ then
 - (a) $\text{cl}_{\text{gr}}(K_t + \bar{a}) \cap M_{\mathbf{m}} = K_t$
 - (b) for any $g \in \mathbf{I}$ and $b \in A_t \cup \text{Rang}(\bar{a}), bg \in K_t gG_{\mathbf{m},0}$.

Remark 6.13. Seems sufficient, but is it necessary?

If G_0 yes; G_0 countable, maybe.

§ 6(B). On Orbital Types of Infinite Tuples.

Discussion 6.14. Concerning Problem 6.7

1) This is highly relevant to the question on the existence of a universal $G \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{If}}$ of cardinality, e.g. $\beth_{\omega}$, but is also of self interest.

2) Trying to prove that the number is small we are naturally led to a try to imitate §2, set $\mathbf{x}$ as there with $G_{\mathbf{x},0}$ not necessarily finite, and we define $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{x},\ell} (\ell = 0, 1, 2)$ as there.

A first problem is that for some find $K_1 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},1}, K_2 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},2}$ for no finite $K \subseteq G_0$ do we have $\ell = 1, 2 \Rightarrow \langle K_{\ell} \cup K_0 \rangle \cap G_0 = K_0$. So assume

- $\boxplus_{\mathbf{P}}$ (a) $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \{\bar{K} : \bar{K} = (K_0, K_1, K_2) : K_{\ell} \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},\ell} \text{ finite}\}$
- (b) $\bar{K} = (K_0, K_1, K_2) \in \mathbf{P} \Rightarrow K_1 \cap K_2 = K_0$
- (c) if $A_1, K_1 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},1}, A_2 \subseteq G_{\mathbf{x},2}$ are finite then for some $(K_0, K_1, K_2) \in \mathbf{P}$.

REFERENCES

- [Hic78] Ken Hiclin, *Complete universal locally finite groups*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **239** (1978), 213–227.
- [KW73] Otto H. Kegel and Bertram A.F. Wehrfritz, *Locally finite groups*, xi+210.
- [Tho86] Simon Thomas, *Complete universal locally finite groups of large cardinality*, 277–301.
- [Sh:c] Saharon Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 92, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.
- [Sh:e] ———, *Non-structure theory*, vol. accepted, Oxford University Press.
- [Sh:f] ———, *Proper and improper forcing*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer, 1998.
- [Sh:g] ———, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh:h] ———, *Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes*, Studies in Logic: Mathematical logic and foundations, vol. 18, College Publications, 2009.
- [Sh:3] ———, *Finite diagrams stable in power*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **2** (1970), 69–118.
- [McSh:55] Angus Macintyre and Saharon Shelah, *Uncountable universal locally finite groups*, Journal of Algebra **43** (1976), 168–175.
- [Sh:E62] Saharon Shelah, *Combinatorial background for Non-structure*.
- [Sh:88r] ———, *Abstract elementary classes near $\aleph_1$* , Chapter I. 0705.4137. 0705.4137.

- [GrSh:174] Rami Grossberg and Saharon Shelah, *On universal locally finite groups*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **44** (1983), 289–302.
- [Sh:300] Saharon Shelah, *Universal classes*, Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1292, Springer, Berlin, 1987, Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T., pp. 264–418.
- [Sh:300a] ———, *Chapter I*.
- [Sh:300b] ———, *Chapter II*.
- [Sh:309] ———, *Black Boxes*, , 0812.0656. 0812.0656. 0812.0656.
- [Sh:365] ———, *There are Jonsson algebras in many inaccessible cardinals*, Cardinal Arithmetic, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh:F981] ———, *Existentially closed groups*.
- [Sh:F1120] ———, *auto group of ex.cl locally finite groups*.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAT RAM, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL, AND, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HILL CENTER - BUSCH CAMPUS, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`